

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

---

THE publication of two posthumous volumes from the pen of Professor PEAKE reminds us afresh how grave has been the loss to British Biblical scholarship incurred by his death. He had something of the versatility of the great apostle whom he so profoundly admired; he combined in his own person the interests of the theologian, the preacher, the administrator, and the organizer. In the field of Biblical scholarship he occasionally spoke of himself as a middle-man, that is, he regarded himself as mediating to the religious public the technical discussions of the great scholars; but that is a characteristically modest underestimate. For he was himself a great scholar, as *The Servant of Yahweh* (Manchester University Press; 6s. net)—one of the two volumes referred to above—attests on every page.

The full title of the volume is *The Servant of Yahweh: Three Lectures delivered at King's College, London, during 1926; Together with the Rylands Lectures on Old Testament and New Testament Subjects*. The book is accompanied by a Prefatory Note by Principal Wardle, and by a brief but wholehearted appreciation of Dr. Peake and his work by Dr. Guppy, the Librarian of the John Rylands Library; and, besides the subject mentioned, the others dealt with are these: The Roots of Hebrew Prophecy and Jewish Apocalyptic; Elijah and Jezebel, the Conflict with the Tyrian Baal; Recent Developments in Old Testament Criticism; The Messiah and the Son of Man; The Quint-

essence of Paulinism; Paul the Apostle—His Personality and Achievement; and Paul and the Jewish Christians. The lectures on The Servant of Yahweh had not been published before, and it is an immense convenience to have these, and the other lectures which were published separately, brought within the compass of a single volume.

Professor PEAKE was one of the very few Biblical scholars who could claim to be equally at home in the literature and criticism of both Old and New Testaments. These lectures, with their expert treatment of the various problems and the exhaustive bibliographies appended to most of the chapters, confirm the impression made by his earlier publications that he had a complete and easy command of the vast material. As much of this material is inaccessible to readers unacquainted with German, this volume renders them a real service by putting them in touch with Literature of the first importance, most of which is untranslated. Here, for example, we may follow the development of Sellin's mind on the problem of the 'Servant' songs in Is 40-55, or we may become acquainted with the attacks on the commonly accepted date of Deuteronomy, or with the view that Ezekiel is a late pseudopigraph. Yet, all through the erudite but thoroughly lucid discussions, we are made to feel that for the writer the supreme interest is never academic, or even merely theological, but religious, and the volume helps us to understand the confidence which was

reposed in Professor PEAKE not only as a scholar, but as a man and a Churchman.

Two features characterize all the discussions, their fairness and their caution. In the discussion of the 'Servant' problem, for example, Dr. PEAKE deals even-handed justice to both groups of disputants, the champions of the individual and the national interpretation; indeed, he devotes even more space to the former, though he profoundly disagrees with it, believing that 'grave objections lie against every form of the individualist theory.' As illustrating his caution, we may take his views on the origin of prophecy and eschatology. Of the former he says: 'At present it is advisable to hold our judgment in suspense on the question whether prophecy was a foreign importation in Israel, and if so from what people it was derived'; while of the latter he declares himself to be sceptical about pre-prophetic eschatology (p. 172), thinking it 'very questionable whether there was in early Israel any developed eschatology at all' (p. 196). The discussion of the origin of the hopeful outlook in which prophecies of doom frequently culminate is indeed a model of balanced statement.

Perhaps the lecture which will attract most attention is that on The Quintessence of Paulinism, though following it very close will be that on Paul's Personality and Achievement. To the interpretation of Paul Dr. PEAKE brought the indispensable qualification of inner sympathy with the man himself and intimate understanding of his experience. He frankly admits, of course, that the great apostle is not always equally convincing to us; there are stretches in his argument that do not impress us. But then he was not writing for us, but for the men of his own race and time; and even so, there are passages in the Epistles that deserve to be ranked as great literature.

Though Dr. PEAKE finds it difficult to believe that Paul studied at the University of Tarsus, he was not, he thinks, unaffected by Greek influences, though these appear rather on the fringes of his thought: he must, for example, have had some familiarity with Greek, and particularly with

Stoic, ethics. He also owed something, though perhaps not much, to contemporary Judaism—notably his doctrine of angels and demons. Very much greater, however, was his debt to the Old Testament, though his endorsement of it was not indiscriminate and uniform, for he did not accept its view of the Law or the flesh. The radiant joy in the Law exhibited by Pss 19 and 119 is very far from being shared by Paul; and while to the Old Testament the flesh was weak, to Paul it is vicious and wicked, needing not to be redeemed, but to be crucified.

But Paul's theological thinking owes most of all to his own experience—his experience of the power of sin and the wonder of redemption as reflected in Ro 7 and 8. The theological formulation of that experience, with its contrast between Adam and Christ, has been relegated by some scholars to the category of unconvincing things in the argumentation of Paul; but in some paragraphs of great power Dr. PEAKE pierces to the substance of Paul's argument and finds it of permanent value. The significance of Adam, as of Christ, is universal, not indeed as a mere individual, but as in a sense the race. 'The Act of Adam is crucial just because it is typical; the nature of Adam is our common nature. Only because Adam was truly representative, could the individual act be charged with universal significance.'

Dr. PEAKE believes that Paul had an adequate knowledge of the earthly career of Jesus: if he dwells by preference upon the Cross, it is because he regards the Cross as the supreme fact of that career—a deed which was mightier than any word; and this may account for his comparatively rare references to the teaching of Jesus. In any case Paul, with his penetrating insight, realized the colossal significance of Jesus; and without such a leader, 'it might have taken centuries to do what he did in a single generation. It was he who detached Christianity from Judaism,' and he largely created a Christian theology and apologetic and a philosophy of history. The glowing words of Professor PEAKE in his estimate of Paul's achievement deserve to be laid to heart by

any who have been so misguided as to belittle Paul.

---

In the lecture dealing with Jesus, which argues that the belief of the early Church in the Messiahship of Jesus goes back to Jesus Himself, occurs an interesting passage in which, as against those who deny the historical existence of Jesus, Dr. PEAKE offers an argument which would prove that existence independently of the evidence derived from Christian documents. The Crucifixion, it is argued, in view of Dt 21<sup>23</sup>, presented a practically insuperable difficulty to Jews; and if some Jews did—as in point of fact they did—accept the Messiahship of Jesus, it can only have been because the story of Him and His death was true. ‘The leaders of a new movement do not create gratuitous difficulties for themselves; nothing but sheer necessity could have forced the Christian leaders to go to their Jewish countrymen with the story of a crucified Messiah.’

---

The lecture on Recent Developments in Old Testament Criticism is a masterly summary of the present position, and it is reassuring to hear from so competent a scholar, after a careful review of the literature of recent years, that ‘the net result of the recent critical movement, it seems to me, is that we are left in the main very much where we were a quarter of a century ago.’ Dr. PEAKE’s own competence as an historical critic is finely illustrated by his lecture on Elijah’s Conflict with the Tyrian Baal. Without committing himself to all the detail so dramatically described in 1 K 18, he maintains that the admitted historical facts point to a great set-back to the worship of the Tyrian Baal in the reign of Ahab, and that the story must contain a substantial nucleus of fact.

---

His very suggestive discussion of the scene on Horeb also happily illustrates his power as interpreter of a religious situation. That scene is so much misunderstood that it will be worth while to quote his comment upon it. “What doest thou here, Elijah?” Elijah had been wrong in leaving his post, wrong in thinking that Yahweh was more truly to be found at Horeb than in Pales-

tine. His attempt to experience for himself what Moses had experienced was an error. The ancient forms of the theophany are revived, but their ancient virtue has gone out of them. They belong to a more primitive stage of revelation, and they have now become obsolete. It is useless to dwell on the dead past or to seek to reanimate it. His task is in the present, his mission is to create the future, his place is in his own country, his mission to his own contemporaries. He must not seek the living among the dead, or imagine that a return to Moses is other than a retrograde step.’

---

Those who have been accustomed to look to Professor PEAKE for guidance and counsel in the criticism and interpretation of the Bible ever since the appearance of his first volume, ‘A Guide to Biblical Study,’ thirty-four years ago—and there must be many such in all the Churches—will cherish with gratitude this last legacy from his pen.

---

The desperate necessities of the age and the increasing pressure of unbelief have influenced all the branches of the Church in the direction of unity in Christian thought and action. There is a growing conviction that the ranks must be closed to meet the grand assault, and that if ever the Church is to be recognized as the pillar and ground of the truth she must speak with one clear unanimous voice.

---

Among the many efforts, official and unofficial, which are being made to reach that unanimity, an honourable place must be given to the Student Christian Movement, which has done so much to bring into common council and comradeship the students of the world, so that they may learn to understand and appreciate each other’s point of view. In furtherance of this end a most interesting and helpful little book has been published, entitled *A Traffic in Knowledge* (S.C.M.; 2s. 6d. net), which is really ‘an international symposium on the Christian message.’ Besides an introduction by the editor, it contains a French, an American, a Chinese, and a Russian ‘approach to the Christian message.’ All these papers are remarkably good,

but while the French by M. Pierre MAURY is most comprehensive and searching, the Russian by Professor V. V. ZENKOVSKY is undoubtedly the most vivid and inspiring. It may be of interest to give some indication of its scope and spirit.

Professor ZENKOVSKY, it may be explained, was Professor of Philosophy at Kiev University before the revolution, and is now Professor of Philosophy at the Russian Theological Institute in Paris, where he devotes all his energies to the building up of a Christian movement among the Russian emigrants, which may in the future become an agent in the remaking of Russia. He writes, therefore, as a member of the Greek Orthodox Church and as one who has felt the full blast of the storm.

The present epoch is in the highest degree critical. 'Never until now has the world known such a bitter struggle between religious and anti-religious forces. Epochs of religious wars and persecutions were epochs of clash between different religious systems. But to-day we witness a successful attack against faith itself; conscious unbelief rises against religion.' In Russia the anti-Christian forces attack faith openly under a government which makes defence of the Christian faith impossible, and urges on the propaganda of godlessness with all its resources. Elsewhere the conflict is more disguised and goes on generally under a veneer of cultured forms. 'But we must not forget that in Russia we see only the first skirmishes between Christian and anti-Christian forces. The struggle against Christianity is being waged everywhere.'

The essential opposite of Christianity is Naturalism, *i.e.* a conception of Nature and man which leaves no place for God. This system worked itself out slowly, but its final development came about the middle of the nineteenth century. The progress of natural science seemed to corroborate the mechanical explanation of Nature and the general principles of Naturalism. In this system man has always been the stumbling-block, for in his morality and in his aspirations he seems to rise above Nature. Naturalism logically means the death of morality, for under it moral values simply disappear. All

through the nineteenth century attempts were made to build an ethical teaching on the basis of Naturalism but without success. And so 'there came a time when amorality became fashionable, especially when presented in an æsthetic garb. And in the empty place, vacated by morality, the propaganda of class-hatred sprang up. The poison of amorality will make itself felt for a long time still in European life.'

The Christian faith offers itself as alone adequate to meet this situation. 'To understand Christian teaching in its relation to the spiritual struggle of our day it is first of all necessary to get a clear conception of the relation between God and the world.' God created the world, and if the world is created by God, it cannot sustain itself alone; it needs God. The Creator of the world is also its Providence. Man belongs to the created world, but he is placed above the rest of Nature. 'Fashioned in the image of God, he received gifts which gave him the possibility of becoming "the son of God" (through grace, not by Nature). In man's freedom is the shining forth of God's image; but this freedom becomes a creative force only when we stand in communion with God. When man tore himself away from God his attempt to be independent of God led to sin, to his downfall.' Man was not the source of evil, but through man when tempted evil entered the world, bringing confusion and casting over it the shadow of death. Thus history began. 'There is so much that is tragic in history as well as in the life of the individual, and the fatal power of evil passions is so destructive that we are sometimes driven to think that life is constant tragedy. There are times when evil triumphs with such insolence, with so little restraint, that the most courageous souls despair and life loses its flavour.'

'But life is not constant tragedy, it is not only an interplay of light and shadow. It contains also the power of goodness, truth, and love. This power is Christ, our Lord and Saviour.' He became incarnate, but His redeeming work was 'accomplished on Golgotha and by the resurrection. 'Our Lord accepted death; His love conquered the

power of death which dominated the world, and His resurrection revealed to the sinful world the path of salvation.' This saving truth cannot be taken in by the mind alone, for it demands a complete union with Christ. 'This is *faith*, a faith which will not only give us knowledge of God, but which is in itself an abiding in God, a communion with Him, a life in God. . . . Our God—we believe, we know it—is always with us; but our heart is continually withdrawing itself from God, so that our spiritual eyesight grows dim. Yet if our heart is wholly and deeply given to God, our Lord will reveal Himself to us.' Thus salvation, though attained by God's power, is attained on condition that man should voluntarily give himself up to God, *i.e.* it presupposes the free will of man.

Professor ZENKOVSKY gives to the Church a vital, and indeed dominant, place. 'We Orthodox believe that men are not saved separately, but together with others, in the Church, in a vital unity which can be attained only through love of Christ and communion with Him. But salvation is attained not only within the Church, but through the Church; for it is attained not by our efforts, not by our merits, but by the grace of God abiding in the Church.'

How, then, are we to fulfil the Christian task in the conditions of our time? 'It is impossible, it is sinful, to retire from contemporary life. Christ came down to this sinful world to regenerate and save it. And we, His disciples, cannot act otherwise.' It is the process of secularization, the sundering of culture from the Church, which is the tragedy of the world and of the Church. We must restore unity; we must link together contemporary life and Christianity. 'This goal can only be attained by making Christianity the very foundation of culture, so that culture should develop organically on the Christian basis.' The Christianity of our day in concerning itself only with the inner life has lost vitality, and is no longer a creative force. 'Unbelief has gained strength from the weakness and languidness of Christians. And if we do not know how to enlighten and sanctify our contemporary life in a Christian spirit, godlessness will grow

and develop however empty it may be.' In these conditions our age 'demands from us a clear and positive answer. On which side do we stand? Will we follow Christ or rise up against Him? We must take a decision and find strength to carry it through.

*Hora novissima, vigilemus!*

We preach the love of God, and many preachers deprecate all reference to the fear and wrath of God, and then we wonder why the world pays no heed to our message. Can it be that we have made the love of God too cheap and the way of life too easy? Have we feared to make our hearers uncomfortable? Have we shunned to declare the whole counsel of God? Are we omitting an element of the Truth which is vital and of quite tremendous import? Our fathers taught men to fear God; have we succeeded in teaching them that there is nothing to fear?

These questions are suggested, and much more than suggested, by the appearance of a profoundly able and heart-searching book on *The Holy and the Living God*, by Mr. M. D. R. WILLINK, S.Th. (Allen & Unwin; 10s. net), a book very much in the line of Rudolf Otto's great work on 'The Idea of the Holy,' and well worthy to stand in that noble succession. It is as fresh and stimulating as a sea breeze, though by some it may be felt as a wind from the bare heights.

'It may be said that there are some suggestions presented here which are out of agreement with the modern idea of God presented in the New Testament. So far as that modern idea is based (perhaps unconsciously) on "Gentle Jesus, meek and mild," as learnt in our childhood, this is perfectly true. There are things as stern and terrible in the New Testament as in the Old, and the modern idea seems to be to pass them over and lay all the emphasis on the more tender and beautiful side of the revelation.' This may indicate the thesis of the book, a thesis which is supported by an impressive amount of scholarly exegesis, of wide reading and of profound and imaginative thinking.

We find mankind everywhere sensitive to a peculiar feeling of an incalculable and tremendous Something behind phenomena, and we may reasonably assume that that sensitiveness is a response to a stimulus that is really there. However variously this august Something may have been conceived, men have ever felt it an awesome thing to approach the Presence. Hence arose among all nations those elaborate systems of taboo, of priesthood and sacrifice by which it was hoped to safeguard the worshipper in his approach, and duly establish contact.

These feelings find their most sublime expression in the Old Testament, which is occupied throughout with the problem of how man can live in fellowship with God. The God of Israel is a Holy God, a Light unapproachable, a consuming Fire. From His presence there flashes forth a certain fiery reaction upon all that approaches, not simply upon man as a sinner but upon man as a creature, for no man may see God's face and live. Interpreters of the Old Testament, in speaking of this, are driven to compare it to electric energy released by a touch. In Scripture it is compared to the lightning and is spoken of as the fire of God. The prophets learnt that this fiery reaction was not automatic or arbitrary, but was under moral control. It was, in short, the fire of the Divine purity and love in violent reaction against evil, burning it up to make the world clean.

The crowning marvel to the prophets was that God was long-suffering and merciful, that He did not consume their sinful people in a moment. Israel was His by a gracious choice. In His mercy He had given a law and an order of worship in due accordance with which His people might maintain harmonious contact with Him. When through Israel's disobedience all these gracious arrangements broke down, the prophets, still full of adoring wonder at the Divine forbearance, carried their hopes forward to some solution of the problem which would be found through the infinite grace and power of God. But they never imagined it to be easy. They never took the love of God to sinners as axiomatic. They never wavered in their conviction

that God is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity, that every vestige of sin must be consumed in the fire of His holy presence.

Large, if vague, outlines began to be seen of how the dread problem might be solved. If the nation dissociated itself from the evil and executed sentence upon it, then judgment might be averted. 'If the nation failed to dissociate itself from the offence and put away the evil from the midst of it there was yet one resource if any man dared to apply it. A representative man might stand before the Lord "in the breach" and offer himself for his people.' So we see Jeremiah in the last desperate days of Jerusalem searching in vain for 'a man,' and we come at last to the sublime picture of the suffering Servant upon whom is laid the iniquity of us all.

It can hardly be that in the New Testament all this is scrapped. Apart from the fact that the Old Testament was inspired scripture to Christ and His apostles, that they were steeped in its teaching about the Holy God and His fiery anger against sin, there is evidence on almost every page of the New Testament that the background is still there. 'We have grounds for concluding that besides His love and patience there was about the Lord an energy and intensity capable of breaking out into daunting anger, which, together with His teaching in the parables, and His prophecies of the destruction of Jerusalem, justified the apostles in carrying forward something of the Old Testament idea of the wrath of God into their teaching of the new order of things.'

They could still say, 'Our God is a consuming fire.' They speak of themselves as men who 'have fled for refuge,' and they warn others to flee. They certainly described Jesus in terms of the suffering Servant and taught that only at infinite cost had He won the salvation of the world. They had the same sense as the prophets had of how wonderful it was that a Holy God should condescend to love and save sinners. This feeling indeed was intensified, for now they knew, as the prophets never knew, what it cost God to redeem. It was against this dark background that the glory of the gospel shone

out so radiantly, like the lightning breaking through a black cloud.

Without the dark background, can we make men see the radiance? When we take the Divine love for granted it ceases to be wonderful. If there is nothing to fear, why should a man worry? If he feels no need of salvation, what relevance has the gospel? Do we touch here the secret of the ineffectiveness of the preaching of to-day? 'In spite of the plain assertion that there are certain things which make it impossible for those who practise them to approach the Living God, it is felt to be uncharitable to say that there may be some people who will not get to heaven. We have rationalised the holy out of our presentation of the Gospel till we have lost its fiery urgency and cleansing power. . . . The time seems ripening for the breaking through of the Life to witness to itself in some new form. What form it will take remains to be seen. It may well be that it will include a new awakening to the recognition that the idea of the Holy does really represent a vital element, not only of Christian experience, but of the essential nature of things, of the Living God from whom our visible world with all its powers has its origin.'

In the fresh and vivid chapters of the late Professor BENNETT's *The Dilemma of Religious Knowledge*, in which are examined various attempts to find a natural equivalent for the supernatural, and so to cancel the difficulty in the idea of an intervention of God from without, there is an interesting discussion of the theory that the intervention of God is to be described as the intervention of the subconscious. Belief in the supernatural, this theory says, is due to ignorance of the subconscious and its workings.

What is meant by the subconscious? In the subconscious we are presented with the idea of a division of the mind into sections or stories. This idea is based upon the character of 'in-and-outness,' to use Professor BENNETT's phrase, which all subconscious phenomena possess. The sensation, the

desire, the memory, and so forth, which have led psychologists to postulate a subconscious, are plainly *in* the mind; yet they are not *before* it, and they may be said to be *outside* it.

There is, however, nothing here to justify the idea of any radical sundering of the mind. The subconscious is not a separate place in the mind, or a separate mysterious self. We must not be misled by the influence of spatial imagery: 'the submerged seven-eighths of the iceberg and the one-eighth above water; the wide body of the bottle and the narrow neck; the reservoir or the storehouse which overflows; the seed germinating in the soil and then sprouting into the air; the antechamber; the penumbra and focus.' These images, useful though they be in the illustration of the relationship between the conscious and the subconscious, are apt to impose the separateness of spatial relations upon our thinking. Complexes, ideas, wishes are not separate mental entities or forces, having a sort of power of motion of their own.

The technique of psycho-analysis presupposes a potential unity of the mind. It is precisely this unity which the psycho-analyst tries to restore. The list of similes—iceberg, bottle, and the rest—themselves spell unity and continuity. 'Just as liquid can pass up from the body of the bottle into the neck and down from the neck into the bottle, so there is give-and-take between subconsciousness and consciousness.' Or again, Freud's censor, who stands guard at the door leading from the antechamber of the subconscious to the front room of the conscious, represents the promise or vestige, whichever way we like to look at it, of the mind's unity; for he is privy to what goes on in both rooms.

How, then, are we to explain such a transaction as is described in the phrase, 'an uprush from the subconscious'? We cannot suppose that states of mind are here involved which exist in their own right. We may speak mythologically, but not scientifically, of neuroses which 'sink' or 'rise' by some mysterious psychic gravitation. Consider the phenomenon of religious experience known as conversion. It may be said that in conversion there

arrangement of psychic pattern, a redistribution of mental energies. But this is only the psychologist's reading of the matter. Is there not another side to it? Is there no escape from the theological prison-house? Must we, as Professor KETT phrases it, 'suffocate' within the walls of self?

urges that in conversion the mind discovers an object to which it can expose itself without restriction. It is a common object for the subconscious and the conscious. Such an object looks like God. From God, and God alone, we do not conceal anything; before Him we are our true and integral selves. All hearts are open to Him, and from Him no secrets are hid.

Now there is no reason why we should be precluded from adopting this explanation of the conversion experience. For all that psychology has to say, conversion might really be the soul's discovery of God. The subconscious may be the place where 'slow processes of maturation' go on which culminate in some invasion of the conscious, but psychology—properly employed—does not prejudge the metaphysical issue and declare the subconscious to be the place in the mind from which the saving impulses come. It does not, in other words, provide a natural origin for so-called supernatural apparitions. 'In conversion the depths of the soul are stirred. True. But it is also true that an angel may have troubled the pool.'

## The Ministry of Books.

BY PROFESSOR JOHN E. MCFADYEN, D.D., TRINITY COLLEGE, GLASGOW.

THE Religious Book Week is just finishing. What has it achieved? That remains to be seen. Its purpose, as defined by its sponsors, was 'to promote the reading of religious books.' It is both strange and humiliating that such a movement should be necessary in a land whose strength has for centuries been her religion and whose God has been her glory. Course books are being read and widely read. *Winter Comes*, *The Good Companions*, *In Search of Scotland*, have had phenomenal sales—the last alone, according to the publishers, running to 1000. But in current religious literature, with the exception of a few books like Dr. Fosdick's, *The Christ of the Indian Road*, there is nothing even remotely comparable to such achievements. A religious book has done extremely well to-day if it reaches 5000—probably one-tenth of such books never come near that number; and there are books by scholars of world-reputation which scarcely touch the thousand mark. Authors—and publishers—frequently incur financial losses for daring to guide the public in the direction that concern their peace.

Why is the public response to religious literature so lukewarm to-day? It must seem astonishing, almost but incredible, to one who considers that

in this country the Christian Church numbers her clergy by the thousand and her members by the million. Is the public indifference to religious books due to public indifference to religion? There are facts, such as our comparatively empty churches, which go to countenance such an explanation; but there are other facts which give us pause before accepting it. The animated discussions of the Prayer Book in Parliament certainly did not suggest that religion is a spent force in this country; and it is frequently maintained—apparently with some justice—that there is to-day a quite unusual spirit of inquiry regarding religion. Broadcast religious services attract wide attention, and even the columns of the secular press are not inhospitable to the discussion of religious topics.

Nor can it fairly be said that the indifference to religious books is due to lack of money to buy them. The rise in the price of books since the War has been less in proportion than the rise in the price of other things; and, as we have seen, other books are being bought; and men can still find money for other things of considerably less importance to their growth in spiritual stature. The money spent by many a Church member on tobacco in the year would, on a very modest estimate, furnish him

every month with a volume costing seven shillings and sixpence—and many excellent books cost much less. The truth is that hundreds of thousands of good Christian people seem to regard as a superfluity books which deal helpfully with the religion they profess, and with the Bible to which they pay a homage which is more theoretical than practical. There are thousands of well-to-do laymen all over the land, who are liberal—and rightly so—in their patronage of concerts, but who, from one end of the year to another, sedulously abstain from the purchase of books, as if such purchase were a crime. Lovely music is, to one who loves it, a gracious and abiding memory :

The music in my heart I bore,  
Long after it was heard no more.

But a good book, which is, in famous words, 'the precious life-blood of a master spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life,' is a possession for ever.

Perhaps, however, the indifference to religious books rests on the vague assumption that such books are incurably dull. There never was a greater mistake. Whatever may be said of the older type of book—and some of them could be stodgy enough, or at least they seem so to a modern taste—that is anything but true to-day. Biblical scholarship has revived the Bible : exegesis and archæology have put into the hands of the layman a Book which he would find to be of entrancing interest, if he would take the trouble to avail himself of the innumerable helps which lie to his hand to-day, adapted to every size of purse and every stage of culture. I have heard a competent judge say of a modern 'Introduction' that he had found it as interesting as a novel, and that he had been so fascinated by it that he had read it straight through at a sitting. Doubtless the public needs some guidance. That is furnished to some extent by reviews, which appear sometimes even in the secular press which is accessible to everybody ; but it might be worth the while of the Churches—once or twice a year—in the pages of their monthly or weekly magazines and under the supervision of their scholars, to publish a carefully selected list of current religious books, with the names of the publishers and prices, and a very brief comment on the substance and value of the books. Following the Bible's own habit of appealing to experience, I should then like to direct to such a list the attention of any who laboured under the delusion that the religious books of to-day are unattractive, and to invite them to 'taste and see.'

More than once Jesus said to the men of His time, 'Have ye not read?' There is an obligation to read, and—as the narratives imply—to read intelligently. A man who does not read is guilty of a sort of unconscious arrogance. He is implicitly saying that he is sufficient unto himself, that he is content with the knowledge (or ignorance) he already possesses, that he can dispense with the labours of others. Other men have laboured, and he has deliberately refused to enter into their labours. Never was the obligation to read more urgent than to-day, and it rests alike upon the members and the ministers of the Church.

Upon the members : for religion is being challenged to-day on a vaster scale than ever before, and they ought to be able to give reasons for their hope and the faith that are in them. In a recent book entitled *The Old Testament and Evangelical Christianity*, which would be well worth translating, Professor Johannes Meinhold, of Bonn, speaking of the perennial influence of Jesus, says : 'Even His enemies, who now hate and persecute all that is Christian more vigorously than ever, think of Russia and even of certain circles in Germany—even they attest, through their vehemence, that He is still a power in the world' (p. 127). To defend His cause against the adversary, every man who names His name needs all the knowledge and wisdom that are available. And if this is true of the Church's members, it is even more true of her ministers. The public has the right to demand that more or less those men who are experts in the field which they have chosen. Those who have elected to be the guides of the people in things that pertain to the soul, and of them it must not be said that they are blind leaders of the blind. They have to serve God, and to help others to serve Him, with the mind as well as with the heart, and they cannot feed others by starving themselves. All the more that they are so deeply immersed in the practical work of their parishes, must they jealously guard whatever leisure they have to equip themselves by serious study for the high task of spiritual leadership which they have voluntarily chosen. It is theirs to communicate light as well as power, and a man cannot transmit what he does not possess.

Men do not live by bread alone, but by word of the living God and of men, the living and the dead. They satisfy their longings with the dreams of the imaginations, the revelations, the discoveries of other minds and souls. On every man lies the sacred duty of acquainting himself with whatsoever things are pure and honourable and uplifting in an

literature that his opportunities render accessible to him. 'Have ye not read?' If not, how shall we excuse ourselves? For all around and open to all but the poorest are the means of dispelling ignorance, mitigating perplexity, solving doubt, sustaining resolution, kindling imagination. Literature is a trust; we must offer to all that would build us up in knowledge or goodness an unhesitating welcome. The worth of the Old Testament carried with it to the ancient Jew the obligation to familiarize himself with its contents. So every gracious thought, every ennobling impulse that books may bring, impose on us a similar obligation. Soul must commune with soul, or it will shrivel and starve and die.

'Have ye not read *what David did?*' What an

inspiration biography might be! The wisdom of the sage, the courage of the hero, the holiness of the saint, are all for us: they will lift us above the limits of our own experience into the liberty of the brave and free. Have ye not read what Abraham, Moses, Jeremiah, Peter, Paul did? What St. Francis, Knox, Wesley did? What Xavier, Carey, Livingstone did? Could so much magnificent, God-inspired manhood pass before us and leave us uninspired? And what the stimulus of biography and history would be to some, the study of Christian thought on its devotional or argumentative side would be to others. In these and similar ways the spiritual life of the Church might be quickened and deepened, and this could not fail to have an impact on the life of the nation.

## The Atonement in Terms of Personality.

BY THE REVEREND FREDERICK A. M. SPENCER, D.D., OXFORD.

WHY was our Lord put to death as a criminal? As Mr. Beibitz remarks,<sup>1</sup> this question may be understood in two senses, a historical and a theological: (1) What were the circumstances that occasioned the hostility to the man Jesus which resulted in His crucifixion? (2) Why was this cruel and ignominious execution of the Christ needful for the Redemption of mankind? The answer to the first question may throw light on the second.

Why precisely did the Jewish authorities conspire to put our Lord to death? According to the Fourth Gospel, it was the apprehension on the part of the Sanhedrin—how far real or feigned is not stated—that Jesus, because of His miracles, would be popularly acclaimed as a deliverer sent by Heaven to free His nation from its foreign yoke, that a revolution against the Roman Government would ensue, and that the Romans would overcome the revolution and proceed to deprive the Jews of what national independence remained to them (Jn 11<sup>47, 48</sup>). According to St. Mark, Pilate perceived that the chief priests were actuated by envy in their demand for His execution, that is, presumably, fear of their prestige and influence being undermined by popular admiration for a teacher who was in certain respects strongly opposed to them (Mk 15<sup>10</sup>). St. Mark had previously intimated that the violent protest made by Jesus against the Temple trade virtually sealed His fate (11<sup>18</sup>). This is quite com-

prehensible, since it is apparent that the High Priest and his adherents derived a considerable revenue from the sale of sacrificial victims, and the exchange of foreign money into Jewish, for the payment of the Temple dues, and perhaps for the purchase of the victims.

The actual charge against Jesus was that of making a false claim to be the Messiah. But the record of the trial seems to show that He had never publicly and in definite words asserted His Messiahship, it being only in reply to the High Priest's challenging question that He admitted holding some such belief about Himself. But it is evident that this charge was of the nature of a pretext. The Jewish authorities were seriously alarmed for their position and influence. They regarded themselves as the representatives of the one and only true religion, and responsible to Heaven for its maintenance. Accordingly they considered it their duty to make an example of heretics who threatened to unsettle the faith of the Chosen People.

Pilate intensely disliked being made the tool of an arrogant and superstitious priesthood in their savage attack on one who had the courage to disagree with them. He was sufficiently shrewd to see that they feared Jesus as a popular favourite, and he conceived the brilliant idea that, with a substantial backing from the populace, he might safely defy this haughty religious aristocracy. So he turned from the priests to the throng of people listening to the trial, and offered to release Jesus

<sup>1</sup> J. H. Beibitz, *What I believe and Why I believe it*, ch. vii.

in accordance with the popular privilege at the Passover season. But it appeared that the other prisoner was at the moment a hero in their estimation, since he had actually killed some one connected with the Government. It may be also that the chief priests had taken the precaution to pack the neighbourhood of the court with their sympathizers. Reflecting that national feeling was apt to be dangerously excitable in Jerusalem during the chief festival, Pilate thought that he owed it to himself, and to the troops under his command, and to the Imperial Government of Rome, to let these fanatical priests have their cruel and unjust way.

Thus the Crucifixion of Jesus appears as the act of the representatives of a decadent and narrow-minded religion to repress new truth. The traditional religion was supported by egoism entrenched in privilege. The new truth was proclaimed in God's name for the salvation of mankind. A foreign government, that had usurped the rule of the country and had rendered its own position precarious by a long succession of outrages, was intimidated into consenting to this judicial murder. Aggressive and vindictive nationalism must also take a share of the guilt. More briefly, the Crucifixion was an act of hate in its effort to overcome love, and the submission to the Crucifixion was an act of love to overcome the hate.

But we should inquire further whether such a death was incidental or essential to the progress of true religion. Was it an unfortunate consequence of the proclamation of the gospel in unfavourable circumstances? Or was it part of the original Divine plan for the realization of the ideal announced in the gospel? And if the latter, what particular purpose did it serve?

I think we may be helped towards answering these questions by the study of the manner in which our Lord Himself seems to have become aware of His impending fate. Now there appears to have been a hopefulness at the commencement of His ministry; enthusiastic crowds thronged His footsteps as He hastened from place to place, preaching and healing. 'And Simon and they that were with him followed after him; and say unto him, All are seeking thee. And he saith unto them, Let us go elsewhere into the next towns, that I may preach there also; for to this end came I forth. And he went into their synagogues throughout all Galilee, preaching and casting out devils' (Mk 1<sup>38-39</sup>). But as time went on, it came home to Him that His mission was, as regards the vast majority, only superficially successful at best. Thus He quotes ironical words which Isaiah professes to

have heard of the Lord God at his call: 'That seeing they may see, and not perceive; and hearing they may hear, and not understand. . . .' Later He is recorded as predicting the doom of the cities of Galilee as a punishment for not responding to His message: 'Woe unto thee, Chorazin! Woe unto thee, Bethsaida! . . . And thou, Capernaum, shalt thou be exalted unto Heaven? Thou shalt be brought down unto Hades.' He remarks bitterly that Tyre and Sidon would have listened to the gospel with better effect (Lk 10<sup>13-15</sup>).

It is obvious that He was disappointed, not only with the religious leaders of the nation, but with the general mass. Accordingly He gives up public preaching and devotes Himself to the instruction of His little band of disciples. And as opportunity offers He attempts to prepare them for the terrible fate that awaits Him. He intimates that He is to be arrested by the Sanhedrin, and handed over for execution to the Roman Government in the land. Only after His death will the Kingdom of God grow and spread as it is meant to. Not long after, He goes up to Jerusalem and there challenges the power of the High Priest by driving from the Temple the traders he had authorized. He further exasperates the religious rulers and leaders by bringing threatening accusations against them under the thin disguise of provocative parables, such as The Wicked Husbandmen. And He neglects to escape, though He knows of the plot to arrest Him and the complicity in it of one of His followers. On the other hand, even a few hours or minutes before He is captured, He betrays a lingering doubt whether it is absolutely necessary for Him to undergo crucifixion, since He prays that the cup of suffering might, if it were possible, pass from Him. From all this we may gather that the comparative failure of His mission produced in Him the growing conviction that He would have to do something more than preach and heal if He was to win mankind for the Kingdom of God, and that something was to die a violent death in shame and agony.

But how, we may ask, did He suppose that such a death would avail? If men failed to put into practice the Sermon on the Mount, or to lay to heart the parables in which He declared God's love for men and the love they should have one for another, how would the Crucifixion induce them to do this?

We may look in vain in His recorded words for any clear-cut theory on the matter. But He probably viewed His approaching death in the light of the famous description of the Suffering Servant in the Book of Isaiah. At any rate St. Luke reports Him

as quoting from this at the Last Supper: 'I say unto you, that this which was written must be fulfilled in me, And he was reckoned with transgressors.' This is supported by the reference to this passage in the Acts, on the occasion when Philip baptized the Treasurer of Queen Candace. The allusion to His death, as a ransom for the deliverance of many, need mean no more than the equally metaphorical phrase, to pay a price for some benefit. The reference to 'remission of sins' in St. Matthew is of dubious authenticity,<sup>1</sup> and in any case probably means releasing from the dominion of sin.<sup>2</sup> More illuminating seems to be the saying recorded by St. John: 'I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me.' This implies that Christ crucified saves men by attracting them to Himself. But the Apostles seem at first to have accounted for the Crucifixion mainly as the fulfilment of prophecy, as St. Peter: 'The things which God foreshewed by the mouth of all the prophets, that his Christ should suffer, he thus fulfilled' (Ac 3<sup>18</sup>).

It was St. Paul who appears first to have conceived, through vivid personal experience, the death of Christ as the means whereby man is reconciled to God. He was intensely aware of having passed from a state of antagonism to God to a state of harmony with God, and this in consequence of his acceptance of Jesus as the Christ, with concentration of his thought on His death and resurrection. Being united to Christ dying and rising, he believes that he too dies to his old life and rises to a new and far better life—the old life of sin and religious disquiet and the new life of righteousness and religious peace and satisfaction. So he says again and again: 'I have been crucified with Christ; yet I live.' 'They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh.' 'Our old man was crucified with him.' 'If we died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him.' 'Ye died, and your life is hid with Christ in God.' These phrases witness to an experience of deep and radical spiritual transformation through mystical union with Christ suffering a violent death and passing to a higher life in closer

fellowship with God. This I take to be the fundamental doctrine of St. Paul on the Atonement, though he occasionally uses legal and sacrificial terminology which have suggested other theories. But they are not to be pressed. When, for instance, St. Paul writes that God made Christ sin on our behalf (2 Co 5<sup>21</sup>), and that He became a curse for us (Gal 3<sup>13</sup>), I think his chief object is to emphasize the degradation to which our Saviour submitted to save us, in order to enable us to realize something of the greatness of His sacrifice and to elicit our gratitude.

There is, however, this difficulty in St. Paul's conception of the Atonement, that though Christ's death was not a death unto sin, since 'He knew no sin,' yet by participation in that death believers in Him die to sin. I suppose he thought of the voluntary yielding up of life as the essential on both sides, the fact that in others the life was sinful not affecting the identity of essence between Christ's death on the Cross and their renunciation of their old bad ways. The character of the life to be shuffled off or destroyed did not appear to affect the applicability of the agency for producing it—namely, the voluntary death of Christ as a permanent fact in the spiritual world. In any case, St. Paul did believe that his own death to sin was brought about by Christ's death to His previous life in mortal flesh. But his interest in the subject was much more practical than theoretical. He was more concerned to lead others to find the same salvation as he had attained through Christ, than to explain the method by which this salvation was effected.

Of the other books of the New Testament the Epistle to the Hebrews and the First Epistle of John are those which contain the most numerous and definite allusions to the death of Christ as sacrificial. But, beyond connecting His death with the traditional conception of sacrifice, they do not offer any explanation of its efficacy for human salvation.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Rashdall, *op. cit.* 159 f.: 'It is difficult in reading this Epistle [to the Hebrews] to say exactly where metaphor or symbol ends and spiritual reality begins. . . . No theory of substituted punishment or of substitutionary sacrifice, of retrospective efficacy or expiation, can derive any real countenance from the language of the Epistle to the Hebrews—so long as we attend to the explanations which the author offers in his own words, and not to the traditional phrases and formulæ which he dutifully repeats.'

*Ibid.* 181: 'Outside the traditional formulæ there is not a word [in the First Epistle of John] to suggest any substitution, any vicarious efficacy, or even any objective efficacy.'

<sup>1</sup> Hastings Rashdall, *The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology*, 38: 'Matthew's account is obviously dependent upon Mark's, and the most conservative critic will have no hesitation in treating this addition as an explanatory gloss.'

<sup>2</sup> H. B. Swete, *The Forgiveness of Sins*, 81: 'The word which the New Testament employs to represent the forgiveness of sins (*ἀφεσις*) signifies remission rather than pardon. It emphasizes not so much the mercy which forgives, as the release which leaves the forgiven sinner at liberty to serve God.'

The theoretical vagueness of the New Testament on the subject of the Atonement constituted an invitation to theologians to evolve their own theories. First, there was the ransom to the devil theory, which appears to have originated in Irenæus. 'Since he [the devil] unjustly ruled over us by an apostasy, and whereas we by nature belonged to Almighty God, alienated us contrary to nature, making us his own disciples, He, the Word of God powerful in all things, and not failing in His own justice, behaved justly even as against the very apostasy; . . . not violently, inasmuch that apostasy dominated over us from the beginning—not insatiably seizing on what was His own, but by way of persuasion, as it beseeemed God to get what He wanted by persuasion and not by employing violence; so that neither the law of justice be violated nor the ancient creation of God perish.'<sup>1</sup> This extraordinary doctrine was developed and set forth in legal phraseology by Tertullian, and passed on by him to later theologians. It was explained that the devil was tricked into committing an offence which gave God a legal hold over him. He was, to use an expressive metaphor of Rufinus, baited with Christ's humanity and caught on the hook of His divinity. This in one form or another was the orthodox doctrine on the subject for some nine hundred years, till Anselm produced an alternative.

Anselm's theory was that man because of past sins owed God more than he could possibly pay, since, however righteously he acted in the future, this was only what was due from man to God and so could never wipe out the past debt. But Christ undertook to pay the debt by a voluntary submission to death, and so enabled His Father to remit the penalty without injury to His own honour. Anselm's doctrine is a compound of the notions of commercialism and feudalism. It is as if the Almighty, as feudal lord, was bound by considerations of His own honour to demand the payment of the debts of His serfs.

Thirdly, there is Luther's penal theory: 'Quite simply the Penal Theory consists in the belief that the punishment for all our sins has been borne on the cross by Christ.'<sup>2</sup> 'He really and truly offered Himself,' he writes in his Commentary on Romans, 'for eternal punishment on our behalf. His human nature behaved as if He were a man to be eternally condemned to Hell.'<sup>3</sup> The condition for

obtaining this remission of penalty was simply faith. 'Believe that He will be your salvation and mercy, and so He will be without doubt,' are his words in his Commentary on Galatians.<sup>4</sup> Whereas Anselm's theory turned on the conception of God's dignity, Luther's turned on the conception of retributive justice as a principle to which even the Almighty must conform.

I am prepared to admit that each of these theories stands for some truth. For instance, the ransom to the devil theory implies that evil will is not to be overcome simply by an exercise of superior force, but must be fairly encountered and defeated as will. I am not sure I should not of the three prefer this theory as being less flagrantly unethical than the others. In any case, we cannot rest content with any or all of them, but should attempt to interpret the Atonement by some higher category, one more in accordance with the best thought of our own age. I suggest the category of personality.

But before proceeding to this, I wish to point to what I regard as a fundamental error common to all those earlier doctrines of the Atonement. It seems to be in all three presupposed that Christ suffered Himself to be put to death in order that God might be able to forgive men their sins. I challenge this presupposition. Granted that Christ submitted to a violent death in order that men might be saved from sin and its consequences, it by no means follows that the main obstacle to this salvation was His Heavenly Father's inability to forgive them their sins. Indeed, the words of Christ cry out against that assumption. Does not the father run to meet the returning prodigal, embracing him and cutting short his self-humiliation? Did not our Lord explicitly declare that the one and only condition of God forgiving us was that we should forgive others. If He had believed that His death was a necessary condition of the forgiveness of sins, how was it that even when He went into Gethsemane He was not yet absolutely convinced that He would have to undergo crucifixion? The whole idea is not only intrinsically absurd and repellent, but is in flagrant conflict with the record of our Lord's own thoughts.

What, then, was the obstacle to salvation? Not, surely, God's lack of readiness to forgive, but man's lack of readiness to respond to the invitation: 'Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand,' in which 'repent' signifies, not so much sorrow for the past, as determination to do better in the future—in fact, a radical transformation of the moral outlook and intention in the light of God's

<sup>1</sup> Rashdall, *op. cit.* 243.

<sup>2</sup> V. J. K. Brook, in *The Atonement in History and in Life*, ed. by L. W. Grensted, 'The Atonement in Reformation Theology,' 215.

<sup>3</sup> Quoted by Dean Rashdall, *op. cit.* 400.

<sup>4</sup> Quoted by Rev. V. J. K. Brook, *op. cit.* 217.

appeal and ideal. It was this transformation of personality that the Crucifixion was needed to effect.

As I remarked above, I propose to interpret the Atonement not by means of any of the subordinate conceptions of human affairs, but in terms of the central essence of human nature, what we signify by the word 'personality.' Now it is characteristic of personality to be at once independent and self-determining, and also to be influenced by neighbouring personality. As we say, man is both individual and social. He goes his own way and fashions his own character for good or ill. And yet the way he goes and the kind of character he makes for himself are largely determined by the behaviour and character of others. Consciously and unconsciously we mould and are moulded by one another. And the characters of social groups persist and change by continuous processes over periods far greater than the lifetime of any of the individuals of which the groups are composed.

It is in the light of these two aspects of personality, its independence and its interdependence, that we should consider the origin and development and persistence of sin and God's method of replacing sin by righteousness. Human life, both individually and *en masse*, had been developing in ways contrary to the principles that the Creator of the Universe had intended for it. This was a consequence, whether inevitable or only accidental, of the independence of personality. But the trouble was aggravated by the mutual dependence of the personalities of which the human race was composed. They incited and supported one another in this undivine behaviour and development, rendering it difficult for any individual to bring himself into conformity with the Divine order. Jesus came into the world to counteract this perversion by the influence of His personality acting and living in accordance with the Divine principles.

He set about His task in the obvious way. He taught the Divine principles of life and manifested them in His conduct. This was not without effect. People were stirred by the devotion to God and kindness to man taught and exhibited by Jesus, and by the witness of God's compassionate power manifested in His works of healing. But they were not stirred sufficiently for them to undergo that radical transformation necessary to enable them to live and participate to the full in a thoroughly Divine Universe—what Jesus called 'the kingdom of God.'

What more could be done? It was evidently not enough for Him to teach the ideal goodness,

nor even to display the ideal goodness in His life. Sin was too firmly rooted to be extirpated in this way. A more drastic expedient was necessary. He must die in accordance with the ideal goodness. For only so could He grip human personalities by means of His personality, bringing to bear upon them such a force of goodness as to transform them into the perfection of God, without which there could be no place for them, or at least no full participation for them, in the Universe of God.

How are we to understand the superior efficacy of a righteous teaching and life culminating in a violent death to that of a righteous teaching and life ending in a normal way? This is not altogether strange, since we know that reformers have advanced the spread of the causes they have advocated by dying in their defence. The cause for which Jesus lived and died was that of love, and the opposite of love is hate. In the Crucifixion we see hate in conflict with love, and the love, by refusing to retaliate and remaining pure and undiminished, is seen to grow in wonder and glory. The love maintains itself and vindicates its superiority in the Resurrection, while the hate, having spent itself, ebbs away. This supreme victory of supreme goodness over supreme wickedness abides as a permanent element in the personality of the Redeemer, and therewith He meets and grips and transforms those who hereafter come within the range of His influence. In this way I interpret the words of Hebrews, that God made the Captain of our salvation perfect through sufferings. By the victory of love over hate in the agony of Gethsemane and Calvary, Christ gained the power to transform the hate-possessed personalities of mankind into personalities alive with the love that is the essence of Godhead.

Love has two aspects, exemplified in the two parables of the Prodigal Son and the Good Samaritan: the love of God for men, however erring and debased they be, inviting their love in response; and the love which man should have for man, uniting strangers and foes into a fellowship of love. The truth of both these parables our Lord manifested on the Cross, both the love of God and the love of man, vanquishing the distrust and selfishness and enmity that marred and made havoc of humanity. The ideal that Jesus taught was realized in an intense form in His death in conflict with opposing forces, and in virtue of this victory became a mighty instrument in His personality for the transformation of all human personalities into the Divine perfection.

Theories of the Atonement have been commonly

classified into 'objective' and 'subjective': according to the objective view, Christ accomplished the Atonement once and for all time on Calvary. According to the subjective view, the Atonement is only effected when, through the story of the death of Christ, men become reconciled and spiritually united to God. As Dr. R. C. Moberly shows, these two views are not so much contrary as complementary.<sup>1</sup> But the real question at issue appears to be whether Christ's death is efficacious solely through the record contained in the gospel narrative and human tradition generally, or whether it constitutes a redemptive reality in the spiritual world spiritually effective. Dean Rashdall trenchantly criticized the transactional theories of the Atonement—those in terms of ransom, of debt and honour, of vicarious punishment, and the like—and revived and expounded what he called Abelard's doctrine. This subjective (or, as it is commonly called, the 'exemplarist') view of the Atonement may, I think, be expressed thus: the soul, contemplating the self-sacrifice of Christ and His subsequent triumph over death, and meditating on all that these imply—the deadly wickedness of man, the all-gracious forgiveness of God, the ideal of righteousness which man is intended to realize, the immortal power of this righteousness—is touched and stirred and drawn, in a passion of penitence and devotion and longing for goodness, to throw itself upon God. Seeking God, the soul finds God, and therewith receives healing and peace and the power to serve mankind and eternal life. Is this, or some such description as this, wholly adequate as an explanation of what Christ did for us by His Death and Resurrection? Many who are repelled by the older doctrines may yet hesitate to accept this as a complete and satisfying exposition.

My contention is that the consideration of the Atonement in terms of personality brings us to a fuller comprehension of its nature and efficacy. Christ overcomes sin and promotes righteousness not only, I would say, by means of the record of His Death and Resurrection, though this is normally requisite as facilitating contact with Him, but also in virtue of personal contact of mystical communion with Christ as with One who has conquered sin by goodness, hate by love. His experience on Calvary and beyond, abiding as a constituent of His being, He applies to us through spiritual contact and interpenetration, and thereby engenders in us the same religious and moral will as that wherewith He achieved the victory of good. The same abhorrence of sin, of pity for mankind,

of devotion to God's will and trust in Him, of heroic endurance for God and man, of love that withstands pain and overcomes death—all this He engenders and rouses in us, and so makes us, in the central core of our personalities, what God our Father would have us be.

The operation of the Spirit of God in us is—so I am led to maintain—mediated not merely by the gospel record, though this is ordinarily indispensable, but also by Christ in His personal presence imparting to us the will which carried Him through the Passion to the Resurrection. It is because it is of the nature of personality to act as personality, not only through the material media that affect the bodily senses, but also, and increasingly in its higher developments, more intimately and penetratingly, that I hold that the Atonement is to be understood in this light. Of the influence of any other outstanding personality of the past we should hesitate to affirm this. Plato influences us through the books he wrote, St. Francis through the books written about him, many great men through the impress of their words and characters on their generation transmitted to ours; Jesus influences us, not only through the written record of His words and doings and impression which He made, but also, as the great volume of Christian piety has never ceased to testify, through continuous personal communion. So, I postulate, He conveys to those who revere Him His great victory of love over hate upon the Cross, and produces, with our assenting and co-operating will, a like victory in us.

For this, I submit, He is able to do in virtue of His unique quality of Divinity. We believe in Him as a Universal Personality, capable of immediate communion with all the children of God, not limited as we are to a few. Ever since He appeared triumphant over death, His devoted adherents have looked to Him as omnipresent to all who have faith in Him as the Son of God, and potentially to all people on this globe, and in that sense the Saviour of the whole human race. It is because the personal derivation from Christ of His victory of good over evil, of love over hate, is so prized, that belief in Him as Divine in this unique sense appears essential to the Christian religion.

Such a theory of the Atonement I regard as in full accord with the conceptions of the Redemption in both the Gospel of St. John and the Epistles of St. Paul. Lifted up from the earth, He draws all men unto Him, that they may dwell in Him and He in them. God was in Christ, reconciling the world to Himself, that Christ may dwell through faith in the hearts of all.

<sup>1</sup> *Atonement and Personality*, ch. vii.

## Literature.

### THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

PFLEIDERER called the Gospel of St. John the *Schmerzenskind der Theologie*—‘theology’s child of sorrow.’ And, however drastic the labour involved, theological writers and readers alike must continually be grappling with the unsolved problems of this most difficult book. A modern handbook which should guide the reader in the latest developments of scholarship was very badly needed, and now we have it from the pen of the Rev. Wilbert F. Howard, M.A., D.D.—*The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation* (Epworth Press; 7s. 6d. net). Dr. Howard holds the Lamplough Chair of New Testament Language and Literature in Handsworth College, Birmingham, and his accurate linguistic scholarship is already well known to students through his laborious work in the completion of Dr. James Hope Moulton’s unfinished masterpiece, the ‘Grammar of New Testament Greek.’ In his recent book, the Fernley Lecture for 1931, we find Dr. Howard as completely master of the voluminous literature on the Fourth Gospel as he is of the grammatical minutiae of the papyri.

Dr. Howard’s independent contribution to the discussion is partly traceable in his vindication of the literary unity of the Fourth Gospel as against the recent (and mutually destructive) theories of partition. Dr. Howard has compiled a list of various peculiarities of style, both in the grammar and in the vocabulary of the Gospel. From the study of the distribution of these peculiarities he has been ‘forced to change his former belief that the Appendix (ch. xxi.) came from a different hand than that which wrote the rest of the Gospel.’ This judgment from such a scholar will necessarily carry great weight. He thinks that Burney has proved that the Fourth Evangelist thought in Aramaic, but does not believe that the Gospel was actually written in Aramaic and then translated into Greek. Dr. Howard prefers a theory of accidental dislocation to any theory of partition, or systematic redaction. Interesting and attractive is the theory of Mr. Greville P. Lewis, who in an unpublished paper has suggested that the sections relating to the cleansing of the Temple and to Nicodemus originally stood in the context of ch. 12. This would solve the chief chronological difficulty in the Gospel as it stands, but, as Dr. Howard thinks, at too high a price.

The distinction of Dr. Howard’s book is rather

the originality of sound judgment than the originality of any new and startling hypothesis. The historical survey of the criticism of the last thirty years in Britain and America, Germany and France is full, reliable, and authoritative. Every considerable contribution has been read carefully and is here discussed; the bibliography is carefully compiled. The third section of the book gives preachers discriminating guidance in the problems of interpretation.

In his critical investigation we find Dr. Howard on what to-day may be termed the conservative side. He is opposed to the theory which would deny any historical value to the traditions preserved in the Gospel. It may be doubted, in passing, whether his preference for the Johannine, instead of the Marcan, dating of the cleansing of the Temple is really justifiable. He thinks that the Beloved Disciple was the Apostle, but that we shall never know who wrote the Gospel. On the recent theory of the supposed debt of the Gospel to contemporary Gnosticism, Dr. Howard says a salutary word; he sees more hope in Odeberg’s parallel between the Fourth Gospel and early Jewish mysticism. Altogether there is no single work on its theme which can be so confidently recommended. It should take its place at once as an invaluable handbook to the modern study of the Fourth Gospel.

---

### A STUDY OF CONVERSION.

What is wrong with the religion of our time? Many answers have been hazarded, and the Rev. L. Wyatt Lang gives us his. He feels that the churches are content to let their members drift along in a more or less theoretical acquiescence in the faith, but without the actual decision to apply it to their life and character which gives power. We trust to education to do all that is needed; and he feels that a conversion is required more often than we seem to think. And how does the Spirit of God become effective in a soul? How does the new life begin, for it to be real and efficient? That is an old problem at which not a few—impatient to see the incoming of the Kingdom—are working eagerly. Are there not laws and rules, they ask, to which the mind and soul conform; which, did we know them and apply them in our preaching and our spiritual work, would make these vastly more resultful?

In one sense that is a dangerous country. In Puritan days, and later, it was mapped out—every knoll and hillock of it with meticulous care—in a mechanical fashion which forgot that there are twelve gates into the Holy City—some facing east and some due west, so that people travelling in diametrically opposite directions do none the less arrive at the same goal; that the wind blows where it listeth, and we, hearing the sound of it, cannot tell whence it comes, or where it goes. Forgetfulness of that caused much unhappiness to many souls. Again and again in spiritual autobiography one reads how this one and that made nothing of religion till he discovered that God's ways are not stereotyped, and that He deals with each soul at first hand, and in an original way. All that Mr. Lang knows well. Still, the mind of man works in certain recognizable and statable ways. And for our guidance now, it is well to know how the Spirit of God has found entrance to it in the past. Accordingly his *A Study of Conversion* (Allen & Unwin; ros. 6d. net), a book in the James of Harvard manner, recounts how many of the great conversions of history were brought about, and seeks for the principles that lie behind them. It is an interesting book, a little marred by a fondness for such unhelpful words as photism and motivation and the like, but only slightly so. The author thinks that the old revival method is not so likely to make appeal to our day, and inclines to hope in Retreats, and Ignatian exercises, and meetings analogous to the Oxford Group Movement. Apparently the characteristic Romanist methods seem to him more likely to succeed to-day than those more familiar to the Protestant.

But the main impression of the book is a renewed sense of the fact that, whatever we may do, we are thrown back on God, and that that God breaks in by many doors, and often along unwatched roads. 'His paths are upon the great waters, and His footsteps are not known.'

#### CHRISTIAN EDUCATION IN INDIA.

The Christian Colleges in India have for a generation been faced by problems so central and so serious that at the request of a Conference of their workers and staffs, held at Agra in 1929, a strong Commission, headed by the Master of Balliol, has been touring India, visiting the Colleges, and considering what can be done to make them more effective in the altered circumstances in which they now find themselves. Once on a day the Christian Colleges stood out alone. They drew the finest

of the students; and their work was on a level by itself. To-day it is not so. In those old times their teachers, untrammelled as they now are by the University Examination System and the like, had much more time than they can spare to-day for definitely and evangelistically Christian work; and the loss of a large part of their share in this seems to many of them a dreadful deprivation, and to be dulling down the Colleges into too nearly mere providers of utilitarian benefits for the youth of India. Yet they are there to provide something very different, to share Jesus Christ. Once on a day baptisms among the students were frequent: a large proportion of the leaders in the Indian Christian Church and in many movements outside are old alumni of such institutions as the Madras Christian College, to name one. It is true that even then the preparation of the College did not as a rule result in baptism till later. But now baptisms are so rare that the Commission doubt if in the last ten years the whole thirty-eight Colleges they visited can show a dozen. This seems due in part to the changed situation. When Christian education was started in India, Hinduism was at a very low spiritual and intellectual level. To-day it has been spiritualized and uplifted in many of its adherents' minds, not a little through the influence of these very Colleges. But this Reformed Hinduism satisfies many minds that formerly would have come over. And on the other hand it seems clear that knowledge of our Western thought and life has had a depressingly materializing effect on many of its Oriental students. Again, the Colleges have grown, or tend to grow, too large, with the result that the personal touch between the Christian teacher and the individual—which experts in the old days reckoned the real source of the spiritual power they exercised so markedly—is being lessened, if not almost lost, while the Indian staffs number among them little more than one-third of Christians, two hundred and forty-five out of six hundred and fifty-six.

All this needs revising. And the Commission, while hearty in its appreciation of the work being done, and very sure that it were fatal to abandon or curtail it, have thought out a plan—detailed and applied to each College in their report—whereby the Christian Colleges might become centres of research—the Theological Colleges, for example, might greatly help in the sphere of Comparative Religion, furnishing preacher's material for the ordinary missionary—and of extension, facing the new situation in a new way. The idea is to make the Colleges, more than they are, the well-head

out of which the effort of the Indian Christian Church will rise and flow.

The *Report of the Commission on Christian Higher Education in India* is published by the Oxford University Press, and costs 3s. 6d. It is well worth close study.

### THE BIBLE.

Two books dealing with the Scriptures in different ways are worthy of attention. One is *Every Man's Bible*, an anthology arranged with an introduction by William Ralph Inge, D.D., F.B.A., Dean of St. Paul's (Longmans; 7s. 6d. net). This volume has many merits. It is beautifully printed and bound, for one thing. For another, the introduction is in its way a gem. In fifty pages Dean Inge says almost everything that any Bible student would want to know. He deals with inspiration and criticism, with each group of books (Poetry, Wisdom, Epistles), and with specially important books (like St. John), with the main teachings of Scripture, and finally with 'How to read the Bible.' But the Dean's purpose is devotional, and he has chosen the noblest passages in the Bible bearing on great subjects. There are four sections in the anthology—God, Christ, the Christian Graces, and the Christian Experience, and under these heads have been gathered what is greatest in Scripture. Each section has a separate introduction, and there are many notes at the end of each. This is a book that will help and delight many.

The other book comes from America, *The Supreme Book of Mankind*, by the Rev. James G. K. McClure, D.D., LL.D. (Scribner's; 6s. net). It is the latest 'Bross Lecture,' and has been preceded by, among others, Dr. Dods's well-known book 'The Bible: Its Origin and Nature,' and by Sir J. Arthur Thomson's, 'The Bible of Nature.' Dr. McClure's purpose is to trace the influence of the English Bible, and he devotes separate chapters to the coming of the Bible to the English, and its effect on education, literature, missions, and on the general life of the English people. It is a fascinating theme, ably and interestingly handled by a competent writer.

### WHAT IS THE OLD TESTAMENT?

Much as has been written to commend the modern view of the Old Testament to the religious public, there is a real place for the excellent and inexpensive handbook with the above title (Epworth Press; 4s. net) from the practised pen of Dr.

C. Ryder Smith, Principal of Richmond College, Surrey, who, besides other books, has already given us two valuable discussions on 'The Bible Doctrine of Society' and 'The Bible Doctrine of Wealth and Work.' Recognizing that the Old Testament embodies both the History and the Religion of Israel, and that some acquaintance with the history is necessary to an adequate understanding of the religion, Dr. Smith devotes his attention to both, wisely, however, reserving his strength and his space for the religion. But the historical sketch is admirably done: in the brief compass of thirty-six pages he gives a vivid conspectus of its course, dropping everything that is not of first-rate importance, and throwing up the salient events and characteristics of each period.

Besides the history, Dr. Smith also deals briefly but lucidly with the geography, with higher criticism, miracles, and the attitude of Jesus to the Old Testament—in short, with everything that is likely to interest any one who is making his first approach to the real study of the Old Testament. In the eight pages devoted to higher criticism he gives a useful summary of the principal facts which have made this criticism inevitable. Beginners who are perplexed by the miracles of the Old Testament will be helped by Dr. Smith's discussion of them, which issues in the conclusion that 'a miracle is only a peculiarly clear instance of the works of a God who is working all the time.' This last sentence illustrates a feature of Dr. Smith's style, which has something of the simplicity of conversation, with a knack of going straight to the point, as when he says that 'beneath this Greek flood' which came in with Alexander the Great 'the old East lived on,' or when he describes the 'miracle' in Jos 10 thus: 'The storm cleared away, and out shone the sun. When the sun began to decline, up rose the full moon in the east.'

Dr. Smith is singularly successful in showing the inherent and potential worth of Israel's religion even in its primitive and less worthy forms, but he rightly insists that it should be judged in the light of its issue rather than of its origin. In its blend of historical and religious interests, the book roughly resembles Meinhold's admirable 'Einführung.' The writer's expert knowledge is never obtruded. He is engagingly frank. 'I believe,' he says, 'that Moses and all the great leaders of Israel that followed him were real men, but not that everything that we read about them is history.' But the timid reader may rest assured that the

book is the work of a reverent and constructive thinker. Written primarily for lay preachers, though it will not fail to appeal to other circles too, it ought 'to reassure the doubtful, and to show that when the "higher criticism" has done its work, the Old Testament is not a less but a more valuable book of religion than before.'

### PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION.

*The Dilemma of Religious Knowledge* (Milford; 9s. net), by the late Charles A. Bennett, formerly Professor of Philosophy in Yale University, is an able and interesting, if inconclusive, volume. Its seven chapters consist of a series of Lowell Lectures given last year at Boston. They have been edited by Professor W. E. Hocking, who in the Preface pays a generous, but apparently just, tribute to the memory of his friend, who died at the early age of forty-four. The theme is the problem of religious knowledge. The author is convinced that the claim of religion to convey insight about the real world may not be denied. 'The metaphysical pretensions of religion are the most important thing about it. We cannot reduce the drama of the religious life to a mere record of mental conflict, to a natural history of the mind.' It is in this conviction that he examines, and rejects, the attempts to hand over religion and its problems to anthropology or sociology or psychology, as though these sciences could provide us with the explanation that would suffice. The anthropological explanation is exemplified in the symbolical theories of Feuerbach, Sabatier, and Santayana; the sociological in Durkheim; the psychological in Freud. The problems of religion are affirmed to be not scientific but philosophical. Anthropology, sociology, or psychology, separately or together, are incapable of taking the place of a philosophy of religion.

We have said that the volume is inconclusive. Professor Bennett hardly goes further than to maintain that the naturalizings of religion which he has described and criticised miss the essence of religion. That may set us on the way to something positive, but unfortunately the projected works in which Professor Bennett would have offered his positive contribution to philosophy of religion are not forthcoming. It may be that he puts a 'cognitive compass' in our hands, as Hocking says, in the form of a doctrine of intuition, of an assertion of the kinship between religious and poetic inspiration; but this doctrine is not brought to expression in the volume before us.

### THE STUDY OF RELIGIONS.

*Polytheism and Fetishism* (Sands; 3s. 6d. net) is a recent addition to the Catholic Library of Religious Knowledge, which is to be completed in one hundred volumes translated from the French. The author of this volume is the Rev. M. Briault, C.S.Sp., and the translator the Rev. Patrick Browne, D.Sc., Professor at Maynooth. The translation is readable and couched in idiomatic and expressive English, although the first sentence of the volume is unpromising: 'One of the facts bearing an eminent character of universality is the mention of God.'

The volume falls into the two parts indicated in the title. In the first part we have a rapid survey in popular style of the Ancient Polytheistic Religions, Babylonian, Egyptian, Persian, Indian, and so on. Such a survey has been often made in recent times, and Father Briault's cannot claim any special merit. Yet he has packed a great deal into his fifty pages.

The second and longer part of the volume is more valuable. Here Father Briault, in giving an account, similarly popular, of fetishist religions, presents often the results of his own first-hand investigations, particularly among the Pahuans of Gabon, a primitive race of Central Africa. Apparently he objects to 'qualify in a lump' the religions of negroes, Indians, Papuans, Maoris, and Kanakas by the single word fetishism. He holds that fetishism takes no account of the real religion of the Primitives. It is his contention that the Primitives believe in a God, in a soul, in good and evil, and that they possess a moral law and forms of worship.

With Roman Catholic students of comparative religion generally, Father Briault thus refuses to give up the theory of ethical monotheism as the earliest form of religion—an ethical monotheism, moreover, which is the counterpart of a primitive revelation on the part of the Deity. It is significant in this connexion that instead of tracing the history of religion in the manner of modern anthropology he treats of polytheism before polydemonism. He regards both the polytheistic and the fetishist religions as aberrations from the one universal or Catholic religion, which began with the first man. As Mgr. Le Roy expresses it in the Preface, polytheism consists of intractable shoots from the primeval trunk, and fetishism of parasitic elements that have clung to it from the beginning, disfiguring and perverting it.

Perhaps the best-known present-day advocate

from the anthropological side of the theory of primitive monotheism is Pater W. Schmidt, but it is a theory which does not meet with general acceptance; and it is difficult to maintain it in the light of the new knowledge of our time.

### LIFE OF DR. JOHN HENRY BERNARD.

Many beyond the bounds of Ireland will turn with interest to the volume, *Archbishop Bernard, Professor, Prelate, and Provost* (S.P.C.K.; 10s. 6d. net), which has been published by the Rev. Robert H. Murray, Litt.D. Dr. Bernard was a scholar of world-wide reputation. His earlier writings were in the spheres of philosophy and history, but as the years went on he concentrated more and more, so far as public duty would allow, on theological, and more especially New Testament, subjects. His *magnum opus* is his Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John in the 'International Critical Commentary,' published posthumously in 1929, two years after his death. It is an enduring monument to his ability and industry.

But while Dr. Bernard's name and fame as a scholar went to the ends of the earth, it was in Ireland—one might almost say in Dublin—that he spent his life, impressing his character and personality strongly upon many sections of the community.

His biographer, who had the advantage of knowing him intimately, has founded this book mainly upon the diaries, note-books, and letters which Mrs. Bernard freely placed at his disposal. He has certainly succeeded in revealing John Henry Bernard 'as a man of many gifts, of large and generous nature, of unwearied fidelity to learning, and, above all, as a devoted priest of the Catholic Church.' But we do not think he has made the best use of his material. It should have been sifted more, and arranged better, and purged of repetition. In support of this criticism we must be content to cite only one instance. It is the instance of the appreciatory references to Dr. Bernard's worth and work. Dr. Bernard played many parts in the course of his distinguished career. He was Professor of Divinity at Trinity College, Dublin, Dean of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Bishop of Ossory, Archbishop of Dublin, and, finally, Provost of Trinity College. But it is wearisome in perusing the volume to read so many appreciations of Dr. Bernard in his various capacities, both from the pen of the biographer and from others. A less facile editorial method would have been desirable.

While we say this, we recognize that these packed pages will be eagerly scanned by those who were in contact with Dr. Bernard or are interested in conditions in Ireland during and after the War. (For while he was Archbishop of Dublin and Provost of Trinity College, Dr. Bernard wrote and received many noteworthy letters on public questions.) We also recognize that the biographer, whose personal outlook upon the things of the mind is wide and extended, has given the reader much of himself in these pages. For that we are grateful to him. We close with a fair sample of his biographical style: 'A bishop may be a great man without being a great bishop. Bishop Butler was a great thinker; Bishop Lightfoot was a great scholar, and the Church is all the richer for the presence of both on the episcopal bench. Can we give either a place in the bead-roll of great bishops? We hesitate. . . . Is not the test of a great bishop this, that he raises the episcopate in the eyes of the nation? . . . Wilberforce, Tait, Benson, Creighton, and Davidson conspicuously answer to this test, and the future historian of the Church will have to give them a prominent place. Among those who have finished their course, who have raised the episcopate in spiritual power and usefulness, we also add the name of Bernard.'

### OTTO'S PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION.

The appearance in English dress of a third work by Otto is an event of great interest. They who remember the cogency of 'Naturalism and Religion' and the thrill of 'The Idea of the Holy' will turn with expectancy to *The Philosophy of Religion, based on Kant and Fries* (Williams & Norgate; 10s. net). Their first experience will probably be a measure of disappointment. The work will seem to be on too small a scale, and to omit all discussion of some topics which we are accustomed to find treated at length in *Philosophies of Religion*. At first sight, too, it will seem to contain little of Otto at all, being mostly Fries. As to the first point it must be realized that this is strictly a sequel to the two former works; and that to get Otto's complete view all three are necessary. As to Fries, Otto is a leader in a School whose slogan is 'back to Fries,' so it is natural that to Fries should be assigned large space. It is doubtful if the work of Fries is well known or widely known at all in this country. Otto expressly denies that this work aims at a rehabilitation of Fries, but it is certain that it will be among us a revelation of Fries who,

we realize, is worth knowing. But Otto does not simply reproduce Fries, he develops Fries's views, especially his notion of *Ahnung* or *Ahnung*. That term is one that does not admit of easy translation or even definition, and the translator has done rightly in letting it stand untranslated in the text, having prefaced an explanatory note. *Ahnung* is a fore-gleam of truth, based on a faculty common in some degree to most, at its fullest in the prophet. Our Scottish word *inkling* perhaps comes nearest what is required. The most interesting part of the work is the discussion of *Ahnung* as an element in religious experience. We fancy that Otto's *Ahnung* will prove as provocative as was his 'numinous.'

As to the translation we can with difficulty restrain our indignation. No one should attempt to translate for publication an important work unless he is master of the idiom of both languages, and has enough knowledge of the particular subject to be able, at least, to use its established terminology. This translator should never have attempted nor been entrusted with this task. Not knowing the philosophical terminology he perpetrates such atrocities as *devisive* for *disjunctive* judgments; *inherences* for *attributes*, reciprocal action for *reciprocity*, the *a priori* religious for the *religious a priori* and *Nature's legality* for *Nature as a realm of Law*. Again and again the reader who knows German will best understand Otto by divining what German probably underlies the translation. We could easily fill a column with its infelicities and inaccuracies; a few examples will suffice. An obvious *auch* is rendered 'also' where the context requires 'even,' and 'individual' should be 'characteristic' (p. 49); 'Followed and unveiled' (p. 86) should be 'traced out and made manifest'; 'assumes' (p. 86) should be 'presupposes'; 'on the contrary' (p. 21) should be 'on the other hand'; 'noticeable' (p. 214) should be 'notable.' Why *kurze* should stand untranslated (p. 37) is a puzzle; a greater one is to know what 'the Glove in the history of religion' can be, or who 'promised' it to whom (p. 17). Lastly, consider this sentence—'the importance of Jesus . . . lies in the fact that he has experience of God and fellowship with God, that he founds this experience and fellowship, and in so doing gives a meaning to the relation with God which would otherwise be totally absent in this particular way' (p. 192). Not having the original before us, we do not know what Otto really says. We are convinced that it is nothing so completely unintelligible as this.

### THE HISTORIC JESUS.

Dr. R. H. Strachan recently delivered a series of Cunningham Lectures on 'Paul's Doctrine of the Christ and its Johannine Development.' These lectures, with certain expansions and additions, he has now published under the title of *The Historic Jesus in the New Testament* (S.C.M.; 7s. 6d. net). This title, though much more attractive than the previous one, is somewhat misleading. Instead of dealing, as one might expect, with the Synoptic picture, the book deals exclusively with the historic Jesus in Pauline and Johannine thought and in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Dr. Strachan lays stress upon a distinction which he makes between 'the Historic or human Jesus, and the Historical Jesus.' 'The only Jesus whom we really know is the Jesus whose power has been felt as Lord and Saviour in the hearts and lives of millions of His followers, with whom they hold communion in simple faith, with whom the great witnesses of the faith have been in intimate touch, so that they were enabled to struggle and to attain, to conquer and to hand on their victory to those who followed them. This is the historical Jesus.' On the other hand the historic Jesus is 'the Jesus who lived, worked, and taught in Galilee and in Judea.' It may be doubted whether this terminology is really helpful or likely to be generally adopted. Dr. Strachan's main thesis is that St. Paul with full knowledge of the historic Jesus made the exalted Christ the theme of his gospel, thereby saving Christianity from becoming a Jewish sect. Gradually, however, the Church was driven to feel increasingly, in opposition to docetic tendencies, that the earthly experiences of the historic Jesus were an essential element in the everlasting gospel. And hence we can trace in Hebrews and the Johannine writings, a certain reaction, a movement 'in the direction of so revaluing the historic Jesus as to make it possible to include his life and sayings as an integral part of the Christian Gospel or "Word."' Whether the movement took place in the way here indicated is an interesting topic for discussion, but in working out his thesis Dr. Strachan has given a great deal of scholarly exegesis and thought-provoking discussion. He finds no place in the New Testament for the merely historic Jesus. From first to last the Jesus who was preached was One who was worshipped, who spoke with Divine authority and demanded an absolute allegiance. Nor is there any fundamental antagonism between the synoptic, the Pauline and the Johannine Christs. 'In the Johannine thought the historic Jesus and

the Pauline Gospel are fused.' Dr. Strachan has given us an excellent piece of work, and perhaps the most admirable things about it are the depth of Christian feeling and the richness of evangelical experience which are manifest throughout the book.

It is twenty-one years since Dr. J. B. Baillie took front rank as an expounder of Hegel by publishing a translation of *The Phenomenology of Mind* with Introduction and Notes. The work is now re-issued in a new edition (Allen & Unwin; 25s. net). It is not a reprint. It has been revised throughout; the translation has been amended; the very valuable Introduction has been practically re-written and contains large additions designed to make Hegel more intelligible. Instead of the two volumes of the first edition, we have now one. Like all the other changes made on the work, this is decidedly a change for the better.

In the number of 'The British Weekly' that came in as we were about to review a volume of sermons by Dr. Harris E. Kirk (an excellent number this of 'The British Weekly' with its religious book supplement), we find a column by Dr. Kirk on what the preacher should read. The preacher should study subjects, he says, rather than read books. Isolated books he obviously means. He should read books related to some idea-system. And the two great subjects which he should constantly keep before the mind, Dr. Kirk says, are, What is the gospel we are trying to preach? and, How can this gospel be interpreted to the modern world? Dr. Kirk is one of these men who carry out in practice what they advocate in print. And this will be discovered by those who procure a copy of *The Glory of Common Things*. This volume contains the addresses that Dr. Kirk delivered in Westminster Congregational Church, London, during the summer of 1930. It may be obtained from The Bookroom, Westminster Congregational Church, Buckingham Gate, London; price 3s. 6d. The first of these sermons has been given this month in an abridged form in 'The Christian Year.'

*On Second Thoughts*, by Professor Henry Bett, M.A. (Epworth Press; 2s. net), is a little book full of good things. It consists of twelve short chapters on such themes as Authority, Emotion, Repentance, Symbols, and the like. They are most pleasantly written, with great sanity and ripe Christian wisdom. The writer's aim is to call for

a reconsideration of some elements of religion which may have fallen into disrepute, and he finds his motto in the familiar lines of A. H. Clough:

'Old things need not be therefore true,'  
O brother men, nor yet the new;  
Ah! still awhile the old thought retain,  
And yet consider it again!

Mr. John Walker, M.A.(Hons.), M.R.A.S., has given us a book which presents 'in an accessible form all the Biblical personages who are mentioned either directly or indirectly by Mohammed in his Koranic utterances.' It is entitled *Bible Characters in the Koran* (Alexander Gardner, Paisley; 6s. 6d. net), and it is all that it claims to be. It deals with sixty-three characters in all, beginning with Aaron and ending with Zecharias, and some of them, like Eber and Nimrod, are rather nebulous and unfamiliar entities. Such knowledge of the Bible, as Muhammad had, had filtered down to him through legend and fantastic oral information which represented or misrepresented Jewish and Christian sources, and, as this book abundantly shows, his Biblical references are a curious medley. Of chronology Muhammad had not an idea: Haman is the vizier of Pharaoh, Mary the mother of Jesus is Miriam the sister of Moses, Abraham and Solomon are true Muslims, and so on. But the longer notices, such as those on Abraham, Joseph, Moses, and Jesus, however little historical value they possess, have a curious interest of their own, as illustrating how easily the religious mind deviates into the fantastic. Mr. Walker presents a readable translation of all the Biblical references—where possible, in chronological order, so that we can sometimes trace the change in Muhammad's conceptions—and he connects the references by useful comments of his own. A book which cannot fail to interest Christian readers of the Koran.

*Reaction and Progress in Religion* (Heffer; 5s. net), by the Rev. W. L. Paige Cox, M.A., B.D., Archdeacon of Chester, is sub-entitled 'A Historical Retrospect with Present-day Illustrations.' But neither title nor sub-title serves to indicate that the exposition is mainly concerned with the Church of England, and seeks to assess the value of past and present movements within that Communion. The standard of value employed by the author is provided for him by the evangelical inheritance possessed by those who stand in the central line of the Anglican tradition. He would have the

Church of England remain true to its historic position as a branch of the Protestant Reformed Church. He is out of sympathy with Anglo-Catholicism in its present-day tendencies, especially in its Eucharistic doctrine and practice. Having more in common with modern Protestant thinkers than with ancient Fathers or mediæval Schoolmen, he prefers the liberalism of Matthew Arnold to the conservatism of Newman. He would rehabilitate in the estimation of Anglicans such progressive Churchmen as Maurice and Colenso. No doubt he tries to preserve the impartial outlook and attitude of the historian, but we fear that before he will be able to do so he will have to be farther away from the recent Prayer-Book controversy. It is unusual to find in the writings of an Anglican dignitary an expressed preference for the Westward position of the officiating clergy at the Sacrament of Holy Communion, 'which symbolises so well the action of God through His ministers as the host at the fellowship-meal,' as also an expressed preference for great corporate Communions. In both respects 'our Presbyterian brethren in Scotland,' as the writer says, are in advance of the Church of England.

It is no more than reasonable that the Bible should be included in 'The World's Classics'; but it is good all the same, that the editors thought it worth while to include it. In the faith that, if there are some readers interested in the anthologies, the essays, the dramas, the fiction, etc., for which they so liberally cater, there are also some who are interested in the literature which has proved the most influential of them all, they have published *The Old Testament* in four volumes, at 2s. net per volume (Milford). Volume i. includes the Pentateuch; volume ii. Joshua to 1 Chronicles; volume iii. 2 Chronicles to the Song of Songs; volume iv. Isaiah to Malachi. It seems a pity that the Books of Chronicles should have been divided between volumes ii. and iii., but perhaps considerations of space made this inevitable. The text is that of the Revised Version, and the notes of RV are also incorporated. The chapter divisions are recognized, but not the verses, so that the format of the book suggests 'literature' much more readily than our ordinary Bibles do. There are no chapter headings, summaries, introductions, or comments of any kind other than the footnotes. The Bible is allowed to speak its own undiluted word and to take its chances among the literary products of other peoples, and it is very well able to do so, especially in these trim little volumes

which, slender in size and beautiful in type, are a joy to handle and a joy to read.

*Founders of Great Religions*, by Professor Millar Burrows, Ph.D. (Scribner's; 7s. 6d. net), is a handy and competent series of introductory studies of the great faiths of the world. The plan is to take nine great prophets, photograph them for us, and add a summary of the religions for which they stand. These studies are quite short, from twenty to thirty pages long, but they include Nanak and Mahavira, the founders of Sikhism and Jainism, who for some reason are less often treated than their fellows. A short chapter of comparison and a meagre list of books for further reading end the work.

*The Independence of the Celtic Church in Ireland* (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net), by the Rev. W. S. Kerr, B.D., Archdeacon of Dromore, is a careful examination of the contention that St. Patrick and his Church admitted the supremacy of Rome. The author is learned in the history of the Irish Church, and his book abounds in references to sources and authorities. His conclusion is that the so-called evidence of the Irish Church's early dependence on Rome is nothing else than 'a reeking mass of forgery and fable.' First he examines St. Patrick's Confession and Epistle to Coroticus and the Hymn of St. Patrick, as also the earliest biographies of Ireland's patron saint, and finds in them no acquaintance with the legend of a commission from—much less a consecration by—the Bishop of Rome. Then he gives an account of the conflict between Rome and the Irish Church over the reckoning of Easter and the mode of tonsure, and over other matters, finding no ground for the view that St. Patrick's successors acknowledged obedience to the Papal See. It was not until the twelfth century that the Irish Church was brought into line with the ecclesiastical system of the rest of Europe. This was largely due to the Danish Christians in Ireland and the Norman Conquest. In his discussions of the influence of the Roman Church in Gaul and Britain, the author still pursues his theme of the Independence of the Celtic Church, but he goes beyond the limits indicated by his title. His standpoint and outlook are sufficiently clear from his concluding sentence, 'Is the day far off when patriotic Irishmen will unite in a Church self-governing, independent, released from foreign jurisdiction, and reviving the freedom and evangelical traditions of the Church of St. Patrick?'

In *The Story of Christendom*, Part I., by Caroline

M. Duncan-Jones (S.P.C.K. ; 2s. net), the writer traces briefly (there are only some 140 pages in the book) the history of the first thousand years of the Christian Church. It is a wonderful story, and nobody could be dull with such a theme. Miss Duncan-Jones has succeeded in packing her twenty-seven chapters with relevant knowledge, but has made it all thoroughly interesting, and her book will bring within the reach of a popular audience a bird's-eye view of the romantic growth of the Christian Church.

*The Challenge to the Modern Church*, by the Rev. J. Morritt Clare, D.D. (Stockwell ; 6s. net), aims at rousing the Church from apathy and compromise to greater vitality and usefulness. The themes on which the writer chiefly dwells are the need of prayer, of spiritual power, and the consecration and Christian use of our possessions. The argument of the book is somewhat loose and rambling, but it is written with considerable force and manifest fervour, and it contains a great deal of suggestive sermon material.

There is no more authoritative and lucid exponent of the so-called Barthian theology than Professor Emil Brunner. In *The Word and the World* (S.C.M. ; 4s. net) he has given us the essence of the matter in five lectures. These deal with the Word of God in relation to Reason, History, Psychology, Science, and the Church. The general reader who has been puzzled and perhaps repelled by Barth's paradoxes and antinomies will find these lectures most illuminating. They are characterized by profound thought, clear exposition, striking phraseology, and downright Christian conviction. The whole book might be taken as a commentary on St. Paul's bold utterance, 'The wisdom of the world is foolishness with God.' This is shown to be true of the world wisdom of

to-day, a world wisdom which has seduced and enslaved the Church itself. It may be that here and there Professor Brunner takes an extreme position and expresses himself without due qualification, but to all who believe that in Christ there is a veritable Word of God, a Word of salvation, these lectures with their bold prophetic note will be exceedingly welcome and heartening.

*This Unemployment: Disaster or Opportunity?* by Mr. V. A. Demant, B.Litt., B.Sc. (S.C.M. ; 4s. net), contains a searching analysis of the causes which have led to the present industrial crisis throughout the world. The writer is peculiarly incisive in his criticism of the economists who in face of overproduction call for reduction in wages and costs in order that production may be still further increased. The application of science to industry has resulted in a vast increase in productivity per unit of labour. 'So, unemployment, the penalty, is now shifted on to a section of the community by the rest who are more successful in maintaining or creating work, instead of being distributed at leisure over the whole community.' Whether the remedy proposed by the writer, namely, Social Credit as expounded by C. H. Douglas, is a sound one must be left to experts to settle, but the least instructed reader will find in this book much that will give him furiously to think.

*The Pinch of Poverty*, by Mr. T. W. Roff, J.P. (S.C.M. ; 1s. 6d. net), gives a short and simple but very sympathetic account of the evils connected with unemployment, housing, and the general conditions of work and leisure. A lengthy appendix is added containing an amount of useful information on the extent of poverty and the provision for meeting it. The aim is to rouse the Christian conscience to greater activity in seeking a remedy for these social evils.

## Great Attacks on Christianity.

### II. Porphyry, 'Against Christians.'

By PROFESSOR JAMES MOFFATT, D.D., NEW YORK.

THE second century produced Celsus, the third, Porphyry, in the line of notable critics who sought to refute Christianity. The two men have been sometimes compared to Voltaire and Renan, but such comparisons are usually misleading, and in this

case particularly so. Porphyry had nothing of Renan's affable sentimentalism ; his tone is incisive as he deals with the Church and the Bible, as incisive as Voltaire's, though he had not a trace of what Professor Saintsbury calls 'Voltaire's snigger-

ing indecency.' The two prominent features of Christianity for him were its worship of Jesus Christ and its devotion to a Sacred Book, both of which broke away from the contour of classical traditions in philosophy and piety, and as a Neoplatonist he deems it his sacred duty to expose the futility of the latter devotion, especially. He did it trenchantly and cleverly, but without rancour. A story is told of the late Frank Harris and (as he was then), Mr. A. J. Balfour. 'The fact is, Mr. Balfour,' said Harris jauntily, 'all the faults of the age come from Christianity and journalism.' To which Balfour's ironical reply was, 'Christianity, of course, but why journalism?' To Porphyry the serious danger in his age did seem to arise from the growing spread of the Christian religion as a menace to civilization and spiritual philosophy. It was in no flippant or derisive spirit that he set himself to undermine the belief of Christians in the Bible. He employed a penetrating, critical spirit in his essay which often reminds us more of Voltaire than of Renan. His genuinely religious spirit and his true appreciation of the New Testament are evident in his letter to Marcella.<sup>1</sup> Even there we detect the acute historical and literary mind of the great philosopher. But this positive and constructive tract came after a larger and damaging investigation of Christianity and its Sacred Book, and it is to this famous, formidable work that we now pass, as a sequel to the attack of Celsus.

Porphyry was educated, if not born, at Tyre, a cosmopolitan centre, where he came into touch with Western as well as with Eastern civilization. He wrote the biography of Plotinus his master, but no Neoplatonist wrote the biography of Porphyry, and our information about him comes from allusions in his own writings and from a brief sketch by the philosopher Eunapius,<sup>2</sup> which preserves what seems to be accurate data. As a young man, probably born about the year 233, he attended the lectures of Origen at Caesarea. He was one of the wandering scholars who were in quest of philosophy, like Justin a century earlier; from Origen he learned the literature and principles of Christianity as a cultured religion. But, either owing to his sharp tongue or to

some youthful outburst of critical fervour, he was beaten by some local Christians, and this may have driven him from Christianity, though there is no real evidence to prove that he was ever a catechumen or a member of the Church. We find him next at Athens, having turned to this centre of Greek culture from any further preoccupation with Syrian philosophy. At Athens, under Longinus the distinguished philosopher, he acquired his knowledge of Greek literature and Platonic philosophy. Here he not only wrote his book on 'Homeric Questions,' but laid up the materials for his later commentary on the *Timæus*. When he left Athens, it was with a linguistic and philological equipment which did not exclude an interest in poetry and mysticism of the Hellenistic type. But in passing on to Italy he reached the goal of his quest. At the age of thirty he became a pupil of Plotinus, the shining glory of Neoplatonism. He was enthusiastic but critical, evidently with a mind of his own as he studied under the great teacher. After six fruitful years, he withdrew to Sicily, partly for reasons of health, keeping still in touch with Plotinus, writing and studying eagerly, and becoming more than ever an ardent missionary of Neoplatonism. By the time that Plotinus died, in 270, Porphyry was the foremost exponent of the system. He was, in philosophy, 'the first of the scholastics,' as Bidez puts it,<sup>3</sup> following Aristotle in logic and Plotinus in theology, no longer content with mystical contemplation, but keenly interested in propounding Neoplatonist views as the sole clue to the problems of truth and faith. It was at this period, probably between 270 and 280, that he composed his treatise 'Against Christians' in fifteen books. Was it part of the reaction against the government's toleration policy, which was resented by political conservatives? Was it a stroke from the literary side, in order to disparage the Church? Such guesses may be made, but they are futile. In all likelihood Porphyry was moved to issue his volume by a sense that Christianity was now the most formidable opponent to Neoplatonism as a philosophy of true religion for the Empire. The Church could no longer be loftily ignored, as it had been by Plotinus, he felt; whilst Neoplatonists like Amelius were willing to take what suited them from the Christian books, as indeed Porphyry himself did upon occasion, the vogue of the Christian religion seemed to him to call for a reasoned exposure of its claims to be the final, inspired religion. He devoted himself to this task, with an unflinching sense of responsibility and with all the powers of his literary

<sup>1</sup> See THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xlii. p. 215 f. It is on the basis of this letter that Harnack's study of Porphyry's religious temperament is based, in the article entitled 'Greek and Christian Piety at the End of the Third Century,' which he contributed to the decennial number of the *Hibbert Journal* (October 1911).

<sup>2</sup> The English student will find this in Mr. W. C. Wright's Loeb edition of *The Lives of the Sophists*.

<sup>3</sup> *Vie de Porphyre* (1913), p. 68.

and critical scholarship. Inside and outside the school of Neoplatonism men were looking to him for a deliverance on the great religious rival of Neoplatonism, with which it seemed to have so much in common. Porphyry's answer was a trenchant reply, which carried the war into the enemy's camp. His own temperament and his interest in propaganda alike forbade him to treat the Christian faith any longer with a philosophical detachment. Even the criticisms which had been made current by Celsus were ineffective in the present situation, when the Church was acquiring such additional prestige and momentum. Something had to be done, and Porphyry did it when he penned his book.

The book created anger and embarrassment in Church circles, like Gibbon's fifteenth chapter. It was answered more immediately than the treatise of Celsus had been. Methodius the bishop of Olympus (or Tyre) at once entered the lists; so did Eusebius, with an early refutation in twenty-five books, and Apollinaris of Laodicea, who wrote thirty. These and other replies from the side of orthodoxy were accompanied by a more drastic policy, for an attempt was made by Constantine<sup>1</sup> before the Nicene Council to suppress what Porphyry had written against the faith. We know from Chrysostom that some copies were still known to Christians at Antioch, however, and it was not until the middle of the fifth century that the work was finally eliminated, by order of Theodosius the Second and Valentinian the Third in their anti-pagan campaign. When the flames burned up these extant copies, the treatise was finally lost to the world. Our knowledge of its contents, unfortunately, has to be drawn from stray quotations and references preserved in later Christian writers. Even the immediate Christian answers have perished; there is nothing in the controversy over Porphyry corresponding to the reply made by Origen to Celsus. Our extant information is scrappy and fragmentary, so far as the actual content of Porphyry's work is concerned. But, although only two or three scraps from the reply of Methodius have been preserved, and, although the copy of Porphyry used by Eusebius 'no doubt was committed to destruction enthusiastically in pursuance of the imperial command, . . . we must remember that Eusebius has a habit of introducing long passages from earlier works of his own into later ones, without acknowledging the

debt,'<sup>2</sup> and this habit has enabled scholars to recover from the *Demonstratio* and the *Præparatio*<sup>3</sup> eight or nine fairly definite echoes of what Porphyry wrote. Augustine supplies us with about half a dozen valuable allusions, but Jerome is an ampler source, though even he is not such a helpful authority as a certain Macarius of Magnes in the fourth (or perhaps the beginning of the fifth) century, who composed an 'Answer to the Greeks,' an apologetic work in which he traverses point by point objections to Christianity raised by some recent opponent. Directly or indirectly this material was derived from Porphyry. It is disputed whether Macarius knew the Neoplatonist's work at first hand, or whether he used two books of extracts from it made by the Roman official Hierocles in his literary resistance to the Church.<sup>4</sup> One difficulty in deciding such a question lies in the fact that some of the objections were common property by this time, Porphyry himself drawing upon predecessors like Celsus. But, as Dr. T. W. Crafer, our English authority, concludes, in the 'Apocriticus' of Macarius, 'the arguments are borrowed so largely from Porphyry that although we cannot claim to have recovered his actual words, we may be sure that we possess the substance of many of his attacks.' When Dr. Nathaniel Lardner, the distinguished Presbyterian scholar of the eighteenth century, published his discussion of Porphyry<sup>5</sup>—a discussion which was the only serious English account until lately, the work of Macarius was unknown. Dr. Crafer in his articles and his translation<sup>6</sup> has recently made it accessible to English students. Now that the fragments of Porphyry have been fully gathered by Harnack in *Porphyrius Gegen die Christen, Zeugnisse, Fragmente und Referate* (Berlin, 1916; a reprint from the Proceedings of the Royal Prussian Academy), the student can trace the reconstructed outline of the treatise, although caution is required in judging

<sup>1</sup> J. Stevenson, *Studies in Eusebius* (1929), p. 36 f.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. Von Wilamowitz Moellendorf in the *Zeitschrift für Newtest. Wissenschaft*, i. 101 f.

<sup>3</sup> He became prefect of Egypt, but he used the pen as well as the sword against the Church. According to Lactantius (*Instit.* v. 2) he adroitly called his book 'To Christians,' not 'Against Christians,' but his arguments reflect what Porphyry had tabled in a larger form, in the wake of Celsus (see Geffckin's *Zwei Griechische Apologeten*, p. 298 f.).

<sup>4</sup> In the thirty-seventh chapter of 'Testimonies of Ancient Heathen' appended to his *Credibility of the Gospel History* (vol. vii. p. 390 f. of the 1838 edition).

<sup>5</sup> *Journal of Theological Studies*, viii. 401 f., 546 f.; xv. 360 f., 481 f.; *The Apocriticus of Macarius Magnes* (S.P.C.K., 1919).

<sup>1</sup> A precedent for burning the works of Arius was found in the similar treatment which had been meted out to the anti-Christian work of Porphyry (Socrates, *H.E.* i. 9).

a book from evidence which reveals neither the style nor the continuous argument of the author.

From incidental allusions in the Church Fathers we know that the first book contained matter discrediting the New Testament and ridiculing the inconsistencies and intelligence as well as the moral character of the apostles and evangelists, whom Porphyry allowed himself to charge with motives of greed or vanity in their mission. This is one of his poorest and favourite strokes. He was fond of attributing the love of money and position to his Christian rivals. In commenting on Dn 2<sup>48</sup> he blames Daniel for accepting 'many great gifts' and a position at the court of Nebuchadrezzar! Evidently it was a popular trick of controversy then, as it has been ever since, to insinuate that worldly motives actuated religious leaders. By the time he reached his third book Porphyry was criticising the Old Testament and the Jews, and in the twelfth book he also mentioned the book of Daniel. But apart from this we know nothing of the order pursued by the writer. That the ground covered in his attack must have included sections on the Old Testament and the New Testament, the life and character of Jesus, and the general faith and practice of the Church, is obvious from the extracts at our disposal. It is not much but it is sufficient for our present purpose. The line of Porphyry's argument is unmistakable. What is significant, as regards his method, is the importance which he attached to the Bible in the Church; he seeks to undermine its influence for ethical and historical reasons, and he appeals not only to popular prejudice, but to literary judgment, employing his resources of learning to discuss etymology, chronology, and higher criticism as well as lower.

His Old Testament criticism was a mixture of sound and superficial material. In order to discredit the Christian appeal to the Bible as the oldest book in the world, he seriously alleged that a more reliable history of the Jews had been written by Sanchuniathon, a legendary sage who was supposed to have flourished before the Trojan War. Porphyry shared the idea of contemporary Christians that priority meant superiority, and *vice versa*; his only plea was that Moses was not a reliable authority because he was not the earliest historian. So far as details went, he objected that a man could not survive after spending three days in the belly of a great fish. Apparently, in his illogical onset against the allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament,<sup>1</sup> he also took exception to

any explanation of the prophet Hosea's marriage which was not literal. But the most famous point he made was upon the Book of Daniel. Porphyry appears to have the honour of being the first to recognize the Maccabean origin of the book. No argument advanced by him excited such alarm and indignation among Christians, if we may judge from the tone and the variety of extant allusions in the Fathers. Fortunately Jerome, in replying to him, quoted largely from his pages, so that on this issue we possess part of his actual language and a substantial record of his keen scholarship. How he came by this view, we cannot tell. But he deserves credit for recognizing the historical origin and aim of Daniel, even although his motive was to discredit the appeal to prophecy altogether. As Professor Montgomery<sup>2</sup> observes, modern interpretation of the eleventh chapter of Daniel is 'a continuation of the ancient historical exegesis introduced by Porphyry.' On this line the Neoplatonist critic has proved to be a pioneer of sound scholarship, and unfortunately even a scholar like Jerome failed to accept his lead. One is only surprised that a critic of such penetration should be capable of objecting to Gn 3<sup>3</sup>. That God should prohibit the knowledge of evil, I can understand, said Porphyry; but why prohibit the knowledge of good as well? Such a cavil smacks more of the popular barrister out to win his case than of the judge. But perhaps Porphyry was not unwilling to include strokes of this kind, in his general effort to disparage the Old Testament. As a matter of fact there are some similar touches of cheap effectiveness in his New Testament criticisms.

The Evangelists, according to Porphyry, were often inaccurate and unreliable. His aim is not to show that the entire tradition is untrustworthy—he knew better than that—but to indicate how far the Gospels are removed from any position of oracular authority or infallibility such as the Church's theory of inspiration claimed for them. Matthew, for example, has omitted an entire generation in the genealogy, at r<sup>11</sup>.<sup>12</sup>; he has also made the mistake of quoting a passage from Isaiah instead of from the psalmist Asaph. Porphyry

vehemently to Christians using such a method in interpreting the Bible. Naturally, for this emptied some of his arguments of their force!

<sup>2</sup> *Daniel* (p. 470) in the 'International Critical Commentary.' Jerome appreciates his learning in Old Testament research, but in the opening of the *De Viris Illustribus* he relapses to the level of calling him names, by referring to Celsus, Porphyry, and Julian as three 'rabidi adversum Christum canes.'

<sup>1</sup> Porphyry freely allegorized ancient writings in expounding his own system, but he objected with

objected to any Messianic interpretation of the prophets, but, he adds, the evangelists were such ignorant creatures that they could not even employ the Old Testament accurately. Does not Mark cite words from Isaiah which come from both Isaiah and Malachi? Plainly the text read by Porphyry contained 'Isaiah the prophet' in Mt 13<sup>35</sup> and Mk 1<sup>2</sup> (Mt 3<sup>3</sup>). To embarrassing remarks like these he added illustrations of another fault; the discrepancies of the Gospels, for example, in describing the crucifixion and the death of Judas (in Matthew and Acts) are adduced. Evidently he also pressed some minor details, for one criticism was directed against the absurdity of calling the lake of Galilee a 'sea,' an absurdity which, according to Porphyry, was the result of the evangelists trying to heighten the miraculous story.

Still more damaging must have been his discussion of some incidents in the gospel story. His analysis of the record led him to ask some inconvenient questions, e.g. What can we think of the stability and intelligence of people who impulsively rose and followed Jesus without serious inquiry? This is a comment upon the call of Matthew in Mt 9<sup>9</sup>. But perhaps the story is a fabrication, the critic puts in. Then, if Jesus bade His disciples forgive wrongdoers up to seventy times seven, why did Peter cut off the ear of Malchus in a fit of passion? (Mt 18<sup>22</sup> 26<sup>51</sup>). How unseemly and inconsistent! Again, so far from being a good judge of character, Jesus must have been either drunk or dreaming when He first called Peter the Rock of the Church and then rebuked him as Satan. The story of Mt 16<sup>17</sup> is no credit either to Jesus or to Peter. The average man of sense, Porphyry sneers, finds it ridiculous that a disciple who could be hailed as a Rock should be afraid of a servant girl. From the allusions to this criticism in the early Christian writers we infer that Porphyry either doubted the accuracy of the story, or reflected sarcastically upon the misjudgment of Jesus. The latter line would correspond to another criticism evoked by Jn 7<sup>8, 10</sup>, where he found a glaring inconsistency in the character of Jesus. Why did He first say he was not going to Jerusalem and then go? (Porphyry's text read *οὐκ* at this point, not *οὐτῶ*). Again, no one really God's Son, who had Himself said, 'Fear not them that kill the body,' would have cried weakly in Gethsemane, 'Let this cup pass from me.' Even a sage with a proper scorn for death would have been above such a plea. Furthermore, taking Mt 10<sup>34</sup> literally, Porphyry, in an access of specious pacifism, objected to the saying, 'I am not come to send peace on

earth, but a sword.' We are not surprised that the story about the Gadarene swine was one of those which he rejected as unhistorical and absurd. But as a rule he accepts the record of sayings and stories, in order to bring out what he believes to be their inherent improbability or illogical character. Thus, in the case of the Resurrection appearances he argues that Jesus ought to have appeared to good, honest men like Pilate, and to intelligent Roman senators, instead of leaving the responsible authorities in a position of such uncertainty that they passed persecuting enactments against the Church. How much trouble Jesus would have saved both sides had He appeared, as He promised the high priest, in His glory! It is interesting that Porphyry singled out a number of sayings in the Fourth Gospel for special reprobation, as, for example, what he decided as the obscure and absurd word in 12<sup>31</sup> (who is this Prince or Ruler? And how can he be cast out of this world into another, when there is only one world?). Also, how stupid is the saying in 5<sup>46</sup> ('If ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me'), when all books bearing the name of Moses were really written by Ezra and the men of his time, 1180 years afterwards! Besides, 'Moses' never spoke of Christ as God, or the Word, or Creator, or crucified! These are specimens of the data deployed by Porphyry in handling the Gospels. It is clear that his criticism was mainly directed against the reliability of their record, and that he conceived the authentic personality of Jesus to have been deflected and deified by incompetent admirers, but he is so eager to make capital out of flaws and contradictions in the Gospels that it is far from clear whether he attributes these to the character of Jesus or to the recorders. The saying about faith removing mountains is ridiculed on Porphyry's literal principles of interpretation; the words about eating and drinking the flesh and blood of the Son of Man (Jn 6<sup>56</sup>) are pronounced so cannibalistic that the first three Evangelists left them out; how could a sensible man, it is asked, say, 'Me ye have not always,' and also, 'Lo I am with you always'? and so on. Such specimens of Porphyry's polemic do not make it easy to believe that he revered the Master even while he made short work of the evangelists. His controversial passion led him in this treatise to deal with the person of Christ less sympathetically than we should gather, from the letter to Marcella, he was normally willing to do.

There is no uncertainty whatever about what he thought of the apostles. They are the villains of

the piece, and his most trenchant attacks are upon Peter and Paul, as represented in Acts and the Epistles. Porphyry hotly derides one sentence in the Apocalypse of Peter as a piece of stupid folly, for the Divine work of creation in the celestial order stands fast, and it is preposterous to allege that 'earth shall present all men to God at the day of judgment, earth itself having to be judged together with the heaven that holds it.' If this Apocalypse was in his canon, the Petrine Epistles were not, however, for he never explicitly alludes to them. His strictures on Peter are drawn based on three grounds. One is the apostle's vindictiveness, shown in Ac 5<sup>1, 11</sup>. Not only did he mutilate Malchus, but he had Ananias and Sapphira put to death. Even if it had been a sin to withhold a part of their property, he should have remembered the saying of Jesus about forgiving to seventy times seven. Then he was guilty of reprehensible cowardice in escaping from prison and leaving his unfortunate guards to be executed (Ac 12<sup>6f.</sup>). Pretty conduct for an apostle, to save his own skin at the expense of other people! Finally he played the hypocrite at Antioch, and had to be reproved by Paul.

The quarrel at Antioch is pronounced by Porphyry to have been silly and childish. He does not side with Paul as against Peter, but insinuates that while both played the fool, the former was meanly jealous of Peter's reputation and success. That is, he employs the story of Gal 2<sup>11f.</sup> in order to discredit Peter and also to suggest unworthy motives on the part of Paul. It is not quite certain whether Marcion or Porphyry is in Jerome's mind when he mentions that some explained Gal 5<sup>12</sup> as a covert attack on Peter, and Gal 1<sup>1</sup> as a disparaging remark on the Twelve, but Porphyry certainly understood 'flesh and blood' in Gal 1<sup>16</sup> as a scornful term for Peter, James, and John. He further took exception to what he regarded as instances of gross and wilful inconsistency in Paul's character. If Paul denounced or ignored the practice of circumcision, why did he circumcise Timothy? Why did this shifty agent of the Church at one time claim to be a Jew, (Ac 22<sup>3</sup>) and at another a Roman (Ac 22<sup>26</sup>)? Why did he say that obedience to the Law was accursed (Gal 3<sup>10</sup>), and that the Law was holy (Ro 7<sup>14</sup>)? Why did this adroit creature discourage marriage (1 Co 7<sup>7f.</sup>), and also denounce celibacy? (1 Ti 4<sup>3</sup>). Porphyry sees in all this an unscrupulous agitator, who does not know his own mind, and who is only consistent in considering what suits his personal purposes. The critic also sneers at the absurdity of 'being caught up in the air to meet the Lord' (1 Th 4<sup>17</sup>). The Greek soul in Porphyry

was repelled by such Orientalism as this, and the statement that 'the fashion of this world passeth away' (1 Co 7<sup>31</sup>)—an unworthy reflection upon the Creator! Another statement of the apostle which stirs his special indignation is the word, 'Doth God care for oxen?' (1 Co 9<sup>9</sup>). How can such an assertion be reconciled with Ps 8<sup>6f.</sup>? Porphyry was certainly like Renan in this, that he disliked Paul. He made no secret of his antipathy to the apostle, though he cleverly expressed it in the form of ethical objections. Some of his attacks are obviously carping, and others are due to a Hellenic inability to appreciate the Oriental mind, which sometimes reminds one of Nietzsche. But he anticipated a number of more or less plausible objections to the teaching of the apostle, which cannot be answered except from a more profound understanding of the Epistles than many Church people in Porphyry's day were able or willing to accept. It is obvious that such criticisms must have been effective in circles where it was desired to depreciate the apostle, and the amount of attention devoted to Paul proves that his Epistles were regarded as a vital representation of the faith. If the Gospels were not reliable, and if the leading apostle was guilty of astuteness and ignorance, how could confidence be placed in the Divine message of Christianity? Such was the interest that prompted the slighting and slight censures of Porphyry on Paul—'slight,' I mean, when weighed in the sober scales of criticism. Porphyry had a poor sense of psychology, and most of his works on human character are pretty thin.

The Neoplatonist's attack included a general discussion of what he judged to be the weak side of the Christian scheme. Here he is to be reckoned with seriously, for it was a question of philosophy. The Incarnation was attacked, as we might expect. Greeks who think that the gods inhabited their statues were at any rate more spiritual than superstitious people who allege that the deity could enter a maiden's womb! The point was also made, why did God let pagans perish in the days of old? Why was the coming of Jesus so long delayed, if it was the one hope and help of the race? And if the Old Testament Law was, prior to Christ, the way of salvation, why was the knowledge of it confined to such a limited section of the human race? Finally, the doctrine of the Resurrection was derided. One subtle, special point, raised earlier by some of the Gnostics, was also made. Is it fair to inflict eternal punishment upon men guilty of sins in time? Did not Jesus say, 'With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you

again?' Then how can finite transgressions be punished with an infinite damnation? These and some other considerations were advanced when Porphyry handled the faith and practice of the Church. The attack was mainly on beliefs, but one curious sidelight upon contemporary Christian life is furnished incidentally by the Neoplatonist's sneer that women were becoming predominant in Christianity. 'The monstrous regiment of women' apparently had been visible in some Italian or Roman circles of the third century, for in commenting upon Is 3<sup>12</sup> ('as for my people, children are their oppressors and women rule over them') Jerome observes that this ought to be a warning to Christians, 'lest, according to the impious Porphyry, matrons and women make up our senate, ruling in the churches and determining priestly rank by their feminine influence.' What was not unknown in Jerome's day at Rome had been satirized earlier by Porphyry, as a phenomenon of local Christianity. Still, such contemporary strokes do not seem to have been so numerous, or at least to have excited such discussion, as the more general criticism that the preaching of repentance made sin less heinous, that Christian belief was blind faith, that Christians did not live up to their Master, and so forth.

Such indications of what Porphyry wrote are sufficient to show not only his methods but his aim. This 'modernist of paganism,' as Bidez calls him,<sup>1</sup> resented the claim of the Christian faith to be the one revelation of divine truth, the faith once delivered to the saints. Porphyry sought

<sup>1</sup> *Vie de Porphyre*, p. 129.

to allow some value for any of the old national cults, on the ground that they conveyed some portion at any rate of the supreme religion which in its purest form was represented by Neoplatonism, and the self-consciousness of the Church irritated him by challenging his tolerant, genial attitude towards the various cults. Hence the vigour of his attack on the Bible. If it could be shown that the sacred authority of the Scripture, to which the Church appealed in its mission, was an illusion, then the propaganda of Neoplatonism would be forwarded. How far he succeeded, we cannot tell. But the impact made by his book upon the Church may be gauged by the answers offered to it and by the successful attempts to suppress it. The vogue of Neoplatonism as a religious movement soon waned. Its later developments popularized it and at the same time tended to reveal its inherent weaknesses as a serious rival to Christianity. But Porphyry's anti-Christian treatise, however unsuccessful as an aid to his own cause, produced far-spread reactions within the Christian Church,<sup>2</sup> and it would have been better for Christianity if its thinkers had frankly faced some of the serious difficulties of Biblical criticism which this acute critic threw so bluntly before the notice of the man in the street as well as of the theologian.

<sup>2</sup> Bishop Severian, the contemporary and opponent of Chrysostom, declares that Porphyry 'perverted many from the truth of God,' and the positive unsettlement of such Christians was accompanied by a diffused uneasiness in the minds of others, if we may judge from the tone of Augustine and Macarius.

## National Contributions to Biblical Science.

### XIV. The Contribution of France to Church History.

BY PROFESSOR JOHN VIÉNOT, PARIS.

#### II.

THIS brings us to the eighteenth century, which has been too much misnamed for its rationalism. After the excesses of dogmatic absolutism, the persecutions of Protestants and Jansenists, and the ruin of all kinds caused by Louis XIV.'s dream of universal dominion, it was inevitable that a reaction should take place, and that some gust of wind should pass over the worm-eaten structures to

destroy the absurd legends and fictions. On the whole, the absolute rule of Louis XIV. had ended in the failure of politics, whether interior, exterior, or financial. The condition of the country, that of the Church, of the finances, of the navy, and of the army was suffering from the faults of the system. Hence there were at first trenchant attacks politically. But the State and the Church

were so closely united that the one could not be attacked without the other, all the more that it was religious absolutism which favoured and inspired the political kind. The necessity, therefore, arose of combating the theological conception of history and the power of 'superstition.' Under the circumstances, rationalism gave to historical study an impetus which continues to the present day. There was still controversy, but it was turned against the Church. History freed itself from the bondage of the Church as well as the State. Religions were regarded as the invention of clever priests looking after their personal interests. The historical sense, the sentiments of justice, sound appreciations were wanting, and the polemics against the marvellous stories of the Church began to bear fruit. We see this in the ruins which men vainly tried to rebuild. It was the age and the school of Voltaire, who was far from being the full liberator that people imagined. The faith of the Church was for him an absurdity, though he preferred a clerical domination to a complete liberty which to his mind was synonymous with disorder and barbarity. The complaint that he had against Louis XIV. was not that he was a despot, but that he was not an enlightened one. The service which Voltaire rendered was that of being a free spirit and a preacher of tolerance. His was a critical spirit *par excellence*, which had no bump of respect.<sup>1</sup> His work is an answer to the discourse of Bossuet on *L'histoire universelle*. He did not let himself be imposed on by any one. He treated individualities or sacred epochs with the liberty that a Renan would show. The main characteristic of Voltaire is that he remained an aristocrat who regarded the masses as incapable of ever taking part in government.

Rousseau also made criticism and history. There is much more of these in his ardent and sometimes declamatory prose than people think. He puts himself at the point of view of the people in whom he believes. He starts from the idea that man has been born free but is everywhere in chains. He is thus the adversary of the despotism which destroys human dignity, and he fights it under all its forms. Besides, he remained religious, but he sought to establish a religion which would uplift and free humanity in place of aiding the State to enslave it. From this point of view, his influence on history has been considerable. He inspired Madame de Staël, Sismondi, Benjamin Constant,

and even Chateaubriand. As a rationalist he was one of the first authors of the religious awakening in France at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries. The influence of the Protestant refugee Bayle and of his *Dictionnaire historique* has not been less than that of Voltaire or Rousseau on the emancipation of the mind. It may be seen in the actions of some of the clergy, and among the revolutionaries of 1789.

The Revolution liberated history, as it did many prisoners. From this date, in spite of long periods of reaction, emancipated souls were not obliged to have their books printed abroad. So much was this the case, that Gabriel Monod could write in 1876, 'Our age is the age of history.' He stated with reason that 'it is Germany which has contributed for the most part to the historical work of our century.' He attributed this superiority to the genius of Germany, her patience in work, and especially to the excellent organization in her universities. In France, from the sixteenth century onwards, the universities were under an orthodox 'conformism' which ruled in the sphere of medicine and law, theology and history. They well-nigh perished. Secondary teaching existed, but under restraint. In Germany, however, the universities fell into line with the intellectual direction of the country because they freed themselves gradually, after having by the Reformation broken with the ecclesiastical and theological traditions of the Middle Ages. It may be added that Protestant theology itself, far from being an obstacle to the more serious studies, became, thanks to the spirit of free inquiry that reigned there, the great domain in which criticism was exercised with the most carefulness and rigour.

In France, the scientific movement centred itself in the magistrature, the clergy, and the academies, but the historic movement did not manifest the same regularity there. This was due to the absence of liberty of mind, the want of superior teaching of an efficacious kind, and the lack of all general scientific discipline. The Académie des Inscriptions, for instance, began in 1816 to continue the works of the Benedictines, and it even offered prizes, but it did not exercise any appreciable influence on the direction of the studies, especially the religious studies. The same thing may be said of the other Académies, where the influence was all in favour of conservatism.

The nineteenth century opened in France with a reaction against the rationalism of the preceding epoch. Chateaubriand felt the new inspiration on his return to France, and directed his first

<sup>1</sup> But has Du Plessis-Mornay not written: 'Truth is the substance of history, it must be stated without respect'?

works towards the restoration of 'religion.' Hence we have *Le génie du Christianisme*, and *Les Martyrs*. After him, there were young enthusiasts, such as Ozanam and Montalembert, who sang of the Middle Ages as being delivered from the condemnation which had been pronounced against them and their monachism.

The Revolution, however, had failed to do its work, especially from the religious point of view. It had seen the problem but had badly solved it. Nevertheless, let us not be deceived: it left its traces on minds and manners, even in the times of imperial and royal restoration. People felt the necessity of proofs, and little by little the archives were opened and texts were published. Guizot favoured this movement, with the result that a twofold work began. On the one hand there was a continuation or renewal of the opposition to the Reformation, and on the other hand a liberation of mind. Let us endeavour to describe by a few facts this double current.

Nothing shows better how far the Catholic anti-critical reaction could go than the famous controversy regarding the Apostolicity of the French Churches. At the commencement of the nineteenth century it was admitted that the first bishoprics of France did not go back beyond the third century. This was due to the researches of the great Catholic scholars of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, who had exploded the puerile legends of the Middle Ages. Little by little, however, the clergy, who were by no means well educated at the beginning of the century, and who had a horror of the revolutionary periods and felt the need also of practical piety, set themselves to uphold all the traditional legends. They credited Saint Martha with the foundation of the Church at Avignon, and held that it was a miraculous bark without oars and sails that brought to Marseilles the first propagators of the gospel, including Lazarus, Maximin, and Mary Magdalene. In the *Revue des deux mondes*, for the year 1844, Charles Louandre denounced this series of pitiable legends, which he declared were worthy, under every aspect, of being added to the stories of Prince Fortunatus or of the 'Four Sons Aymon.' Such is the tendency of certain minds to believe everything, that a translation of the *Golden Legend* was published, which the Church itself had long since relegated among the most apocryphal tales. Louandre asked, 'Have sacred criticism, science, and history anything to hope for from the ultra-Catholic school? This school has lost, in ecclesiastical criticism, the good traditions of the science of the past. . . . In

history, it has shown itself as credulous as the Legendaries, and carried away like the Leaguers.'<sup>1</sup>

The movement went on, nevertheless, supported by Dom Guéranger, the restorer of the Benedictine Order in France. The liturgy was revised from the traditional point of view, and Dionysius the Areopagite was once more regarded as having been the first bishop of Paris. The controversy filled throughout the whole century, the Papers of the academies, and the provincial societies. The Legendaries and the upholders of the League were welcomed even in the Papers read at the Sorbonne. There were Catholic bishops and scholars of sincere piety who opposed the movement, but these were considered to be simple-minded (as Launay, Tillemont, Fleury, and Dupin were), or to be tinged with Jansenism or Protestantism, and the legendary school triumphed. Its fantastic theories may be found in the manuals of ecclesiastical history used in the great seminaries from 1850 to 1886, such as those of Blanc, Richon, Rivaux, and Doublet.

The scientific honour of Catholicism was saved by the *Analecta Bollandiana*, which first appeared in 1882, and by the *Bulletin critique* of Mgr. Duchesne. The latter writer was treated as another Renan, and he lost his place as Professor at the Catholic Institute of Paris, in spite of the support of Mgr. d'Hulst. This, however, did not prevent him continuing his useful work, which brought the question to the point where the great scholars of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries had left it.<sup>2</sup> The anti-critical reaction lasted as long as the violent attacks continued against all independent historians. But there is no reason for dwelling further on this, especially as it had many counter-attacks.

The other movement, that of the liberation of minds in the domain of religious history, commenced at the beginning of the century with an almost unknown book of Madame de Staël, *Des circonstances actuelles qui peuvent terminer la Revolution*.<sup>3</sup> She was followed by Quinet, Michelet, Sainte-Beuve, and others. The star of Michelet, which paled for a time, has reappeared to-day. He had the gift of life, and his principal talent lay in getting the people to view an epoch. Sainte-Beuve set himself to speak of the Jansenists in his *Port-Royal*, and did so with justice, his production

<sup>1</sup> *Revue des deux mondes*, January, 1844.

<sup>2</sup> The book to read on this question is that of Albert Houtin: *La controverse de l'apostolicité des Églises de France au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Paris, 1903.

<sup>3</sup> A work published for the first time by John Viénot. Paris, 1906.

becoming the precursor of the more convincing works of Gazier. The Revolution of 1848 had already brought an enlargement of the field of history. Writers were now beginning to understand that ecclesiastical history could not be reduced to a narration of quarrels between orthodox and liberal parties, that it was not concerned merely with popes, prelates, and theologians, or with elaborating new theological or liturgical systems, that it ought to be more concerned with the needs of the masses, whose religious and moral interests could not well be separated from practical problems, and that it was necessary to give place to the great spiritual, moral, and social movements, such as the democratic organization of the ultramontane party or the birth of social Christianity. The soul of man was expanding. Literature was no longer a technical affair of harmony and sound—it penetrated deeply into the human heart. Taine gave an example of this in his *Histoire de la littérature anglaise*, by enabling the people to see the spirit of the English Reformation and Renaissance in the work of Methodism. Ecclesiastical history was benefiting from the greater liberty brought about by circumstances.

All this was due in great measure to the reorganization of the universities and the higher education, a view which accords with the judgment formulated in 1876 by Gabriel Monod. At the present day, ecclesiastical history is being studied everywhere in France. There is no province that does not have its Académie or some rival society. All of them publish *Mémoires*, the value of which depends on the state of culture in the district. There are no doubt old hackneyed ideas and phrases, traces of century-old prejudices or of unconscious ignorance, but there are also new works and important documents. The historian cannot do without these provincial contributions, which are often valuable. Here and there also the mind is being emancipated under the influence of the reform of the universities, begun about twenty years ago by Liard with the help of Auguste Sabatier. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the university was the *bête noire* of French Catholicism. In this matter one has only to remember the denunciations uttered by Dupanloup, the bishop of Orleans. Since then the Church has changed its method, and it has introduced into the university many of its own party. This makes matters more normal, for it is necessary that all ideas should be represented there, and they now are. It produces some rivalry and helps progress. It is well to see at the Sorbonne a Rebellian, the

historian of Bossuet, and colleague to the Dantonist Aulard, or to see Mathieu there, who is known as a follower of Robespierre. The historian of the Church may receive benefit from their divergent writings. Moreover, there has been established near the university an *École des hautes études*, which has a section dealing with religious sciences. Such scholars as Albert Réville, Auguste Sabatier, and Jean Réville have taught there, and the lamented archbishop of Upsala, Nathan Söderblom, studied there under these masters. It was there that Eugène de Faye first enunciated his views on Origen. Ecclesiastical history and sacred criticism are also subjects at the Collège de France. Here Renan, after Quinet and Michelet, spoke freely, as the Révilles did later, and here quite recently Loisy has put forth his views, now published in three volumes of *Mémoires*, from which there is much to be learned. The *École des Chartes* sets itself to make professional historians and custodians of archives and documents, and within its walls the partisans of the past rub shoulders with the bolder spirits of the present. One cannot say now, as was done in 1876, that the establishments where such men as Hauser, Ch. Pfister, Lucien Febvre, and Paul Meyer taught have no influence on the direction of historical study. In any case Gabriel Monod was satisfied with the progress which the *Revue historique*, founded by himself in 1876 along with Fagniez, made in good methods.

It would be unfair to pass under silence the rôle which has been played on the field of history by the Protestant Faculties of Theology, such as those of Montauban, Strasbourg, and Geneva. Their works at the beginning of the century were as mediocre as their Faculties of Arts. But Montauban soon produced *L'Histoire des Protestants*, by G. de Felice. Geneva furnished Chastel; and in the School known as the 'Oratoire' we find Merle D'Aubigné, the author of *L'Histoire de la Réformation*, a romantic but living work which had the merit of awakening enthusiasm for a past that was still badly known. At this time, however, the greatest works of scholarship came from Strasbourg. It was there that Stahl studied, Matter unravelled the mystics, and Eugène Reuss, Baum, and Cunitz undertook the vast publication of the *Opera Calvini*. After the war of 1870, the Faculty of Paris took the place of that of Strasbourg, and renewed its traditions, producing Lichtenberger and his *Encyclopédie des sciences religieuses*, A. Sabatier, S. Berger, Bonet-Maury, Jean Réville, Eugène de Faye, and among its pupils Paul Sabatier.

Protestantism, even in the midst of its ruins, has

always been busy with history. In the eighteenth century it prepared its materials during its exile in Lausanne. Scarcely were the churches reorganized when they found ready to their hand a *Musée des protestants célèbres*, in which there was already more method and genuine criticism than in many a later work. Then the brothers Haag finished their great enterprise of *La France protestante*, in ten volumes, about which Michelet said, 'It has resurrected a whole world.' In 1892 Ch. Read, the Haag brothers, and the Coquerels founded the *Société de l'histoire du protestantisme français*, which has published up to date about eighty volumes of studies and documents indispensable to every historian. The use of these has been facilitated by three volumes of tables, which lead to rapid verification and research. The Society has gathered together in Paris a unique collection of books and manuscripts, which forms an inexhaustible source of new research. Among the workers whom it has grouped around it, one name symbolizes their historical conscience, their courageous patience, and their indefatigable labour—that of Nath. Weiss.

All these works have not been without fruit. By a cursory glance at them, one can see that on no ground of history has passion so far been extinguished. But it is certain that, apart from the supporters of the legendary school, who are still

marked by prejudices and the hope of impossible restorations, progress is being made every day towards a larger comprehension of the past and a clearer view of the truth. It is with ecclesiastical history as with general history. As G. Monod says in recalling a remark of La Popelinière, 'Without proposing any other aim or end than the advantage to be drawn from truth, history is working in a quiet and sure manner for the grandeur of our native land as well as for the progress of the human race.'<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Works that may be usefully consulted on this subject are: Gabriel Monod, *Du progrès des études historiques en France depuis le XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, *Revue historique*, i. Jan. 1876; Paul Sabatier, *De l'importance de l'histoire religieuse pour la formation de l'esprit public*, Strasbourg, 1921.

For methods, the following are useful: Camille Julian, *La conversion du monde à l'Hellénisme*, an opening address at the Collège de France in 1921. But most of all, the ecclesiastical historian should make use of the collection entitled *Les sources de l'histoire de France*, Paris. The first volume, devoted to the Middle Ages, is the work of Molinier; the two volumes dealing with the sixteenth century have been drawn up by Henri Hauser; the volumes relating to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries have appeared under the direction of Louis André. At the present day these volumes are an indispensable instrument of work.

## In the Study.

### *Virginibus Puerisque.*

#### All Saints' Day.

By THE REVEREND S. GREER, M.A., AYR.

'Christ hath brought life and immortality to light.'—  
2 Ti 1<sup>10</sup>.

LAST evening was a kind of eerie time, and little folk had maybe a quakey, shivery sort of feeling when they went out into the darkening garden with their lanterns. For it was All-Hallows Eve, or, as it is called in Scotland, Hallowe'en; and some foolish folk used to say that there were witches about then, and queer things happened, and spells were wrought. Superstitious people would try that night to twitch aside the curtain which hides the future, and peer into the unknown.

That night, too, is to be seen after dark a strange

company of folk in Pendle Forest, Lancashire, each of them carrying a lighted candle, as they cross the dark spaces. And woe betide the luckless wight whose candle is extinguished. It was not, they knew, just a puff of wind which blew it out. For in that forest on All-Hallows Eve witches, they say, go trooping by unseen, and it was one of the weird sisters who blew upon the candle, and ill will befell the bearer ere the year is out.

We laugh at all that. But that is what religion once was in our land, and what it still is in those countries where the knowledge of Jesus has never been brought: black magic and superstitious terror of evil powers lurking in the darkness. Jesus has turned up all the lights on life, and every ugly and wicked thing scuttles out of sight. 'He hath brought life and immortality to light.'

Instead of witches you little folk believe in fairies.

I know a wee fellow who built a house with his toy bricks, with bedroom and bed complete, in case some wandering fairy out late at night had no place to sleep, and *he's sure the bed was slept in*. When we're young, we think of the world as full of happy little presences, and that is right. Are you one of these dear wee girls who are just a bit frightened at night when Mummy goes away, and leaves you alone. Was that a fairy or a brownie in your room?

I think it is a brownie, but I'm not quite certain, Brownies never wait to say, 'How do you do?'

Whether it was or not, or whether it was just the sound of your eyelashes brushing on the bedcover, we know the world is full of a kindly loving Presence, and with God's care about us we may always be confident and happy.

What a change Jesus has wrought in the world! In ancient days All-Hallows Eve was the festival of a heathen god—the sun-god's feast, which is why we still celebrate it with apples and nuts and bonfires kindled on many a hill. Then all the powers of darkness were abroad in force, so that people's minds were filled with terrible fears. Jesus altered all that. From eerie terrors of death, He turns our minds at All-Hallows Eve to the remembrance of all the good men and women who have ever lived.

To-day is All Saints' Day. Let us be very real about it. You may read through a whole calendar of saints, and your blood never tingle, nor your heart beat faster. Let us make our own private calendar of saints, a list of all the people we know or have heard of who have caught the light of Jesus on their faces, who are brave and true and unselfish as He was. Many of you will be thinking to-day of dear home-folk, and thanking God for those who have beaten a path for our feet, and quietly given up things for our sakes. Then you should be recalling all brave and unselfish deeds, remembering all who served in the Great War, and the miners who again and again have gone back into gas-filled pits, risking their lives to save their comrades, and those seamen who in collisions have stayed down in the engine-room to shut off steam, lest the ship blows up before the boats are launched. Jesus is honoured in our reverence of those who have caught His spirit, and who live with His courage, and march with His hope.

It is never enough that on All Saints' Day we just remember the good men and women of all time; we must try to follow them. I once saw a little fellow standing beside a tall soldier in the

street, and there was a look of rapture on the wee chap's face, for he had just succeeded in touching the guardsman's hand. That's it! We must touch their hands, those hero-saints of ours, and try to learn their secret, and catch their enthusiasm. Jesus was their Inspirer, and if we make Him the Lord of our lives, He will put in us the same courage and unselfishness and gentleness as shone in them.

#### Covetous and Envious: A Tale of St. Martin.

BY THE REVEREND J. W. CLAYTON, SUNDERLAND.

'Take heed and beware of covetousness.'—Lk 12<sup>15</sup>.

Even young folks can be covetous, greedy, grasping, always wanting more than they've got. And they can be envious, grudging others the things they themselves do not possess—even their pleasures. There is not much to choose between them. They are ugly weeds to grow in anybody's garden—worse than weeds, vices. They spoil beauty of character, and make life a misery when it should be a joy.

Generations ago, in the long dark nights of winter time, there was difficulty in passing the evening hours. There were few amusements, and lights were so dim that no work demanding close application could be done. The peasants would gather in each other's kitchens, and while away the weariness by telling stories—folk-lore, bits of local history, personal memories, tales of heroes and saints. This is one of the stories they used to tell of St. Martin.

St. Martin was humble, unambitious, and unselfish. On a certain day of cold, biting weather he had met a shivering beggar, and tore his monk's habit in two, giving the frozen man half of his own garment. For long, despite extraordinary qualities, he remained just an ordinary monk, never seeking high position or place. But, at last, they elected him Bishop of Tours. Martin hid himself where they had great difficulty in finding him. But they did find him, and forced him into accepting the office. He had much knowledge of human nature, and was not without wit in dealing with some of its ugliest weaknesses.

One day the saint was going along a road, to a church at which he had an appointment, when he fell in with two men. A short conversation with them filled the saint with disgust. That it was certain to do with such a man as St. Martin, for he found out that one was a very covetous man, and the other equally envious. Then and there he made up his mind that ere he left them he would give them a lesson.

After a lengthy walk they reached the church

to which the saint was going, standing in a fork where the road divided. 'Here,' said St. Martin, 'we must part. But ere you go your way I will bestow upon you a parting boon—though it will rest with yourselves what you make of it. Whichever of you first wishes shall have his wish fulfilled, whatever it be. And the one who does not wish shall have exactly double what the other has wished.' Having said this he left them.

The two men went on their way with sparkling eyes. But as they went—and thought—the boon did not seem so simple as at first. They were in a cleft stick. The greedy man would not wish, for he wanted the double portion. The envious man would not, for he could not bear to think of the other having twice as much as himself. As a result, they went along the road both silent and miserable.

But the covetous man began to be annoyed at the thought of what they might be missing. 'Why don't you wish?' he said. 'Not me,' said the envious man, 'and make you twice as rich as myself.' On they went, more silent and miserable than ever.

At last the annoyance of the covetous man deepened into anger—he could endure no longer. Seizing his companion by the throat, he said, 'If you don't wish, I'll choke you!' 'Well—if it's a choice between choking and wishing,' gurgled the envious man out of his compressed throat, 'I'll wish.' And he smiled a very nasty smile. 'I wish I may be blind in one eye.'

The wish was granted, and immediately one of his eyes closed. But at the same instant both the eyes of the covetous man closed—for ever. The first man went through his life with but one eye; the other was a blind beggar all his days.

That was one of the stories people told hundreds of years ago. It taught effectively that covetousness and envy may turn boons into banes, blessings into curses, and make people utterly wretched. True—they are unclean birds to be allowed to nest in anybody's heart.

## The Christian Year.

TWENTY-FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

### A Future and a Hope.

'I know the thoughts that I think toward you, saith the Lord, thoughts of peace, and not of evil, to give you future and a hope.'—Jer 29<sup>11</sup>.

Much of the mischief of the world is done by people who call themselves optimists: those shallow, talkative folk who are always going about

glossing over the grim realities of life and crying, 'Peace, Peace,' when there is no peace.

Yet they have their uses—this particular passage belongs to a letter that Jeremiah wrote as the result of a collision with an optimist.

The circumstances were these. There were two stages in the Babylonian Captivity. Nebuchadnezzar captured Jerusalem, and sent away the flower of the people in the beginning of the long captivity, but he allowed the city to remain, and during an interval of some eleven years Jeremiah remained in Jerusalem, while Ezekiel, his colleague, had gone out with the first company.

Jeremiah knew that the captivity was going to be a long experience. He counselled the king and the people to accept it as part of the providence of God and not entertain false expectations. But they were not willing to accept that kind of counsel, and were more inclined to listen to prophets who glossed over those grim facts.

He wrote a letter to the captives in Babylon, who were suffering from the same sort of optimism that was troubling the people in Jerusalem. He urged them not to listen to the easy-going prophets. Their exile was going to be a long and trying experience. But, he said, do not lose heart, or become discouraged. Buy lands, settle down, plant your fields, engage in business, marry and give in marriage; but under no circumstances allow that to obscure your mission in the world as the people of God, or cause you to lose faith in His great purposes in the hearts of men. 'For,' says God, 'I know the thoughts that I think concerning you, thoughts of peace and not of evil, to give you a future and a hope.'

'A future and a hope.' It is not so translated in the King James's Version. The phrase there is 'to give you hope in your latter end.' But the real meaning is 'a future and a hope'; meaning that while we are going to do our duty as men in the various circumstances of our economic, physical, and social life, which will create problems for solution by our religious life over and over again, we are never to allow our interests in this earthly life to cause us to despair of our mission, because God has given us a future and a hope.

That is a tremendous thought for our times. We have to get some inspiration out of our vision beyond our work; and if we can see nothing beyond our work, if we see only gloom and mist ahead of us, then the bravest spirit will lose courage.

Something beyond our work! That is what Jeremiah is thinking about, and he not only pro-

mises them a future, but a future *and a hope*, because a future without hope would hardly serve the purpose. Here is a distinction of some importance between optimism and hopefulness. Hope sees farther than optimism. Optimism, as a rule, is based upon a kind of wish that the future may be as we would like it to be; and there is the impression of a vague, futile kind of philosophy that all things are working for the best somehow or other. In other words, optimism is our view of the future before experience has tested it. Hope is what is left after experience has done its work. That is a very different thing. We have had all sorts of optimistic outlooks completely set aside by facts. We have seen hope gloriously survive the impact of facts. That is why hope, rather than optimism, is the word of the Bible.

This picture of what Jeremiah said, and his idea of a future and a hope impinge upon something very interesting in every human life. There are side by side in every man's soul twin impulses: one is the impulse to rest, to seek safety; and the other is the impulse to travel, to take risks, to adventure oneself to unknown things. And that resting impulse, that nest-building habit—for that is what it means—comes sometimes to dominate a man's life in the desire to get hold of some tangible property. For example, those of us who have read *The Forsyte Saga* know how that magic, almost religious word of the Victorian order, 'property,' played such a part in the sense of stability in the homes of England.

And we all know there is another side of our nature that cannot be interested in that sort of thing. It wants to travel, to adventure, to take risks. It goes out in dreams and imaginations; it has its outlook in music, and art, and poetry, and especially in religion. Since the great awakening of the Renaissance in Europe in the fifteenth century we are a people who have largely lost the vital sense of eternity. We are people living largely within the confines of time, and the problems that engross our attention are those of the material side of the world's business, what is known as the economic order, and nearly all of our important thinking is devoted to that kind of thing until the eternal philosophy to-day is one of economic rationalism, which tends more and more to engulf all of the capacities and powers of the human heart in a great mass of materiality. So that the travel instinct in man, that impulse to go on pilgrimage, that daring and adventuresomeness, seems to have gone out of our modern cities and out of our modern leaders, and has been replaced by this lazy, half-

hearted spirit of fear, fear of anything that may disturb us. We have got the sense of time, but we have lost the sense of eternity. We have lost the sense of being personalities. Yet all the same eternity is all round about us. What our modern world so much needs to-day, and particularly our Churches, is a reawakening to the immanence of eternity for us, which is all around us, which impinges on our spirits.

From the beginning of the Christian era it has ever been this faith that has kept alive in human hearts, under all sorts of conditions, a hope, a courage, and a joy, and the acceptance of the implications of life, which have always been associated with that great confession of Peter and his associates, when they said to Jesus, 'Thou art the Christ, the son of the living God.'

This is the essence of Protestantism, that God has joined issue with man, has Himself invaded this mortal world incarnate, and identified Himself with man. What God has died to save, that God must have. So we believe in the rapacity of God. Do we suppose we can easily destroy a mother's love for the boy who has broken her heart over and over again? The more she gives, the more strongly she holds on. Shall God give less than that for us?

One of the reasons why we Christians are not interesting the great spiritual thinkers outside the Church is, because the Jesus we have been showing to them in our faith and in our lives is too small a Saviour to match the tragic necessities of their sober hours. We have made a great deal of the humanity of Jesus. A man does not want to find in Jesus Christ simply a good companion to go with him on the journey of life. He wants to have God, with the most intense and consecrated contact with Him, to lift him out of himself. And that is what the world is waiting for. If the Church does not show that kind of Christ, it has lost God. What matters it whether people call us decent people or not? Decency is no boast, for Christian people least of all, because many of the great saints at one time or other were anything but respectable. What is wanted is an overwhelming manifestation in the Christian life of those virtues that Mr. Chesterton dared to call 'unreasonable,' and which do not appear to be virtues until they are unreasonable, those virtues that, people will say, nobody with any common sense would think of living like that. People must have a reason for the faith they have. That is what Peter said to his disciples. You need a reason for the hope that is in you, so that when people see you are really living like this, suffering

like this without loss of courage, you can say, 'We have sanctified Christ in our hearts as Lord.'

This saying of Jeremiah is a very great saying. Around us is the world, at heart a very disturbed world, and it is going to get no easier in the immediate future. God has sent us to this world of unrest to say what Jeremiah said to these captives, on the authority of a greater name than that of Jeremiah: 'I know the thoughts I think towards you, thoughts of peace, and not of evil, to give you a future and a hope. You shall find Me if you will seek Me with all your heart.'<sup>1</sup>

#### SUNDAY NEXT BEFORE ADVENT.

##### The Aftermath of Troubles.

'The clouds return after the rain.'—Ec 12<sup>2</sup>.

Such is the solemn and sombre phrase in which the preacher, who had surveyed 'all the works that are done under the sun,' and has found them all to be only 'vanity and vexation of spirit,' approaches the darkest, blankest, and mournfullest of all mysteries attaching to human life—death. He knew—and who could know better than he?—that 'the light is sweet,' and 'a pleasant thing it is for the eyes to behold the sun'; but, after all, though 'a man live many years and rejoice in them all,' yet the end is and must be nothing but darkness. 'All that cometh is vanity.'

But before the end comes there is the dreary vestibule of death to be passed through; it is old age. And the Preacher depicts the coming of old age under the figure of a storm gathering in the sky, when 'the light is darkness' and 'the strong men tremble and bow their heads for fear,' and 'the doors are shut in the streets, and the sound of the grinding is low,' and the faintest noise is a terror, and 'desire itself fails, because man goeth to his long home, and the mourners go about the streets.'

1. It may not be inopportune to dwell for a little while upon the characteristic features of old age. For old age is in an especial sense the province of religion. Suppose the case of a man who believes in nothing beyond the present visible order of things. He makes the best of life while he is strong and happy; he 'rejoices in his youth'; his 'heart cheers him in the days of his youth'; he 'walks in the ways of his heart and in the sight of his eyes'; yet, as he grows old, there is no consolation, no illumination which he can set against the visible failing of his physical powers

and the narrowing of his social interests and the dying of his friends as fast as the falling leaves in autumn. That was the preacher's experience too, for he possessed no such faith as would transcend the barrier of the grave. Unto him all was vanity.

How different is the old age of a Christian!

The soul's dark cottage battered and decayed,  
Lets in new light through chinks which time has made;

Stronger by weakness, wiser men become,  
As they draw near to their eternal home.

But in old age, and even in Christian old age, there is apt to be one characteristic which is always unlovely. It is what the teacher seems to adumbrate in the text, 'The clouds return after the rain.'

Let us try to interpret his meaning. It is not only that the clouds collect and then empty themselves upon the earth, but that they 'return after the rain.' There is, as it were, a second night, an aftermath of darkness. It is the ground-swell in human hearts, when the winds and waves of tumult have abated.

In old age this return of the clouds, as the preacher calls it, is apt to take the form of a certain querulousness. The storm has died away; but it is as though the fitful murmur of the storm could still be heard. Instead of taking the failure of physical powers with the gracious patience which invests the sunset of life in a halo of glory—when the spirit grows purer and lovelier as the bodily strength ebbs away—a man or a woman may be for ever dwelling ungratefully and irreligiously upon the charm of the days which have been and are no more and can never return. But to live a life of regrets is to desecrate the sanctity of life. It is never well, as a French moralist teaches, to diffuse one's sorrows, making others, and those perhaps who are nearest to us and dearest, bear a part, and it may be a chief part, of our burdens. Noble souls will keep their sorrows to themselves; they will make of sorrow itself a well-spring of sympathy, as they draw from a broken heart the sweet waters of comfort for other hearts which are nigh to breaking—that is the Divine rule; it was so that our Lord Himself both lived and died. We who are Christians shall in our poor measure follow His holy example. We shall reflect that the palm trees which cheer with their shadow and their fruit the travellers in the desert may sometimes spring beside the waters of Marah. After all, in youth as in age, a complaining temper is forbidden to the Christian. 'Fret not thyself,' says the Psalmist.

<sup>1</sup> H. E. Kirk, *The Glory of Common Things*, 9.

'I dare no more fret than I dare curse,' was a favourite saying of John Wesley.

Such is the Christian temper; it is the temper of all true religion. Amidst failings and sufferings the saints have 'rejoiced evermore'; they have bidden the past farewell in the hope of a bright and a better future; they have not suffered the clouds to return after the rain. So that pagan saint, the

Halting slave who in Nicopolis  
Taught Arrian,

wrote of himself in words which seem to breathe the very spirit of a pre-Christian Christianity: 'Old as I am and lame, what power have I, save to sing praise to God?'

2. Again, there are storms in life as well as still, sweet hours. The most intimate sacred relations are marred at times, and must be marred, human nature being what it is, by occasional differences. It is not the difference, however sharp, which matters so much; it is the grumbling which lives after it. 'The clouds return after the rain.' It is the little persistent spitting of rain, when the storm is over, which renders the home well-nigh intolerable. If there lurks in our hearts any flickering ember of an old dispute, any grudge against anybody for something which has happened in the past, any feeling of malice or acrimony or rancour, may it die here and now through the sovereign grace of the Highest, and may it come to life no more!

Or again, we may be suffering a great disappointment. It may have saddened our life. But do not let us brood upon it, do not suffer it to be the cause of ill-feeling or isolation. Do not let 'the clouds return after the rain.' Few virtues are more Christian than generosity. To be capable of rejoicing in another's success, when it is our own loss—that is a spiritual triumph.

3. One more thought, not wholly dissimilar, let us look at. There is some sin, some evil habit, which has long clung to us. We have fought against it; and we have deemed that we had overcome it; and now it has come back, 'the clouds have returned after the rain.' Ah, that is the hard thing not to conquer once, not to repent but

In thoughts

Not e'en in inmost thoughts to think again  
The sins that made the past so pleasant to us.

The law of life is not a straight, undeviating, unfaltering progress, but a little flow of the tide and then an ebb for a while, then another flow, but each wave in the moral life, as in the material, a little higher than the last until the tide is full. Do

not let us lose heart. Even if we slip back a little to-day, we will be further advanced to-morrow than we were yesterday. But how great is the discouragement of the moral reflux, though it be but for a time. To come to church, to come even to Holy Communion, and then as soon as it is over to feel a return of the old temptations, and strivings, and perhaps the old failures—these are the heart-saddening and heart-sickening experiences. We could survive the storm; but it is the sequel of the storm, when 'the clouds return after the rain,' that darkens and saddens our souls.

Let us turn our thoughts to the spiritual testimony of one who has left perhaps of all men the deepest and strongest impression upon European history in the last four or five centuries, Martin Luther. It is told how even he looked at times with hesitating doubtfulness upon the wonderful experience to which God had called him in his past life. To quote a passage from Dr. Tulloch's *Luther and Other Leaders of the Reformation*: 'The thought of his daring and strange career would sometimes awaken the hidden chord of grief. As he and Catherine [his wife] were walking in the garden one evening, the stars shone with unusual brilliancy. "What a brilliant light," said Luther, as he looked upwards; "but it burns not for us." "And why are we to be shut out from the Kingdom of Heaven?" asked Catherine. "Perhaps," said Luther with a sigh, "because we left our convents." "Shall we return to them?" "No," he replied, "it is too late to do that."'

'The clouds return after the rain.' Yet they do not return for ever. The Spirit of God shall one day scatter them like the wind. Soon or late, if only we are faithful, the heaven will be bright again, and the 'Sun of righteousness will rise with healing in his wings.' It is not to those alone who have won the day, while they still live in the world, but to those who have gone on trying and trying again to win it, despite many a defeat and many a reverse, that in the end the benediction of the Highest shall be accorded, 'Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.'<sup>1</sup>

FIRST SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

The Call to Conversion.

'Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil: learn to do well.'—Isa 1<sup>6</sup>. 17.

Isaiah's endeavour is to awaken in his nation its slumbering spiritual susceptibilities, to arouse it

<sup>1</sup> J. E. C. Weldon, *Time and Eternity*, 70.

by the offer of pardon, and to bring it back to simpleness and sincerity of life. His aim is to produce what would now be called a great social and religious reform—a reform, however, consisting not merely in the removal of palpable anomalies, but having its root in a complete change of heart in the individual. This is what in other parts of the Bible is called a turning back, or returning to God, and, also in the New Testament, a change of mind. The heart of the natural man is perverse, it will go its own way, which is seldom the right way: it must be educated by teaching, by the example of one's elders, into the right way, until, by the grace of God co-operating with it, it *turns back* from its own way, and *turns to* God. By a Latinism, the proper sense of which is sometimes misunderstood, this turning to God is called by the technical term *conversion*, that is, a thorough or complete turning. It is a mistake, however, to suppose that the change which we call conversion always occurs in exactly the same way. But, whether it is to be accomplished gradually or suddenly, the turning from sin and worldliness and turning to God is the necessary antecedent of a holy life. And this is what the prophets, addressing their selfish or worldly contemporaries, often say: as Hosea (14<sup>11</sup>), 'O Israel, return unto the Lord thy God; for thou hast stumbled through thy iniquity. Take with you words, and return unto the Lord; and say unto him, Take away all iniquity, and receive us graciously.' Jeremiah speaks similarly (18<sup>11</sup> 35<sup>15</sup>): 'Return ye now every one from his evil way, and amend your ways and your doings.' And in the Acts it is said of various converts that they 'turned unto the Lord' (9<sup>35</sup>).

The other word expressing a similar idea is the one commonly rendered repentance, but meaning properly, at least in the New Testament, change of mind. This is the word used by John the Baptist, when he first preached the baptism of repentance—of change of mind—unto remission of sins, and when he came forward to announce the coming of Christ: 'Repent ye—or, change your mind—for the kingdom of heaven is at hand'; 'bring forth fruits worthy of repentance,' or again, of 'change of mind.' And St. Paul, describing before King Agrippa what he did after his conversion, uses both words together, telling him how he went to both Jews and Gentiles bidding them to change their mind and turn to God, and do works worthy of their change of mind (Ac 26<sup>20</sup>).

The prophet, in the words of the text, thus strikes one of the keynotes of Advent—repentance, or change of mind, a complete breaking with the past:

'Put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil'; and the adoption of a new manner of life for the future: 'Wash you, make you clean; learn to do well; seek judgment, set right the oppressor, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow.'

The same thought is set before us by St. Paul in phraseology suggested by the Christian dispensation, in the passage from his Epistle to the Romans which the Church reads on this first Sunday in Advent.

Isaiah selects two faults specially for censure.

1. The first is formality in religion. The Jews were always prone to believe that, if they performed regularly the external offices of religion, their duty towards God was sufficiently discharged, and moral obligations might be disregarded. Moral deficiencies, with at least many of them, were a matter of indifference, provided the formal routine of festival-keeping and sacrifice was properly observed: it was this, they persuaded themselves, which received God's favour, and it was something far easier to observe than the restraints of morality.

Isaiah's words in the text contain a lesson for our own times, and apply to others besides those whose hands are literally 'full of blood'; regularity in church-going is no cloak and no excuse for dishonesty, or hard-heartedness, or envy, or jealousy, or evil-speaking, or enmity, or similar faults, such as, it is to be feared, are still not unknown among those who observe regularly the outward offices of religion.

2. The other fault which Isaiah especially attacked is *the abuse of position* on the part of those enjoying power or authority. Corrupt rulers, unjust officials, the maladministration of justice, the abuse of power and wealth on the part of those a little better off than their neighbours, leading to the oppression in various forms of the poor and the unprotected, are and always have been a crying evil in the East. The legislation of the Pentateuch sought in vain to guard against them; and the prophets are constantly inveighing against them. Corrupt judges and rulers are unheard of in our country at the present day; but dishonesty, extortion, attempts to defraud—there is still the crying abuse of what are known as 'sweated industries'—take among ourselves quite the same place as the oppression of the fatherless and the widow, the violent seizing of other men's lands, and the withholding their right from the poor, which are so vehemently denounced by the prophets. Jerusalem, we must also remember, was in Isaiah's time what would now be called a fashionable capital; and where wealth and fashion

reign supreme they are nearly always accompanied by selfishness, inhumanity, and oppression. Isaiah deplores the deterioration of society in Judah from its more glorious past. 'Thy silver is become dross, thy wine mixed with water.' So he foretells the nemesis which will overtake the too careless nation. 'Ah, I will ease me of mine adversaries, and avenge me of my enemies.' The prophet announces the coming judgment, and the need of true amendment of life for those who wish to escape the final consequences of their sin; only those in Zion who turn to God in penitence will be delivered when the day of judgment breaks. The judgment comes in many ways: it falls upon nations, it falls upon corrupt governments, it falls upon individuals.

The declarations of Isaiah were never fulfilled precisely as he anticipated. Many of those whom Isaiah had in mind escaped, we may be sure, all temporal retribution whatever; and when a judgment did fall upon Jerusalem, it never, we may be equally sure, picked out the wicked and spared the righteous. But Isaiah expresses an eternal truth in the form in which he and his contemporaries apprehended it: he declares the retribution which, in the natural course of God's procedures, or by the natural operation of the laws by which human society is regulated, very commonly falls upon those who defy the cardinal principles of morality or religion. In the age of the prophets nothing was known about either rewards or punishments in a future life. These only entered into the sphere of revelation at a much later stage of its history. In the light of the New Testament we are entitled to extend what Isaiah says to embrace the hereafter. Isaiah is thinking of the nation, which, as a whole, and especially in the persons of its upper and responsible classes, he regarded as corrupt; he himself no doubt has thus in his mind a great national catastrophe such as has often in history brought to its end an immoral rule. But retribution for sin may fall also upon individuals; it may, when it comes, surprise us unawares; it may take the form of some temporal penalty; it may fall upon us in the hour of death, or in the day of final judgment.

The season of Advent may thus become a time of looking forward to, and preparation for, not only our annual commemoration of the first coming of Christ, but also for His second coming. Let us then take to heart the lesson that the prophet would have us learn; let us, to use the imagery of St. Paul, awake betimes out of sleep: let us cast off the works of darkness and put upon us the

armour of light by which we may ward off the assaults of the Evil One, and be able to fight as Christ's soldiers, in the kingdom of light into which we have been translated, that so, when the time comes, we may be fit to appear in the presence of our Lord.<sup>1</sup>

## SECOND SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

### The World's Ideal Friend.

'I have called you friends.'—Jn 15<sup>15</sup>.

The history of the world is made roseate through stories of friends and friendships. The most exalted mood of man is that in which the mystic blending of heart with heart is felt; when moving about in the shadows and loneliness of existence, he suddenly comes to realize that his soul has been lost and found again in the being of another. Asked the secret of his beautiful life, Charles Kingsley replied, 'I had a friend.'

A genius will some day dip his pen into the heart-blood of the race and write for us a volume of most fascinating beauty. His theme will be 'The Story of Great Friendships.' He will recite anew the story of the friendship existing between Socrates and his pupil Plato, between David and Jonathan, between Ruth and Naomi, between Aristotle and Alexander, between Paul and his fellow-workers and fellow-sufferers. And when this skilled historian thus calls the roll of the great narratives of friendship, he will discover that of all friends the first and holiest is Jesus of Nazareth.

*Jesus was a most intimate Friend.* The intimacy of His friendship is without parallel in the history of man. He possessed a unique genius for friendship, and His friendship was not fettered by convention. It was free, sympathetic, and warm. His thoughts, as Charles Lamb suggested, slid into the minds of His disciples in a most beautiful and natural way. They unconsciously came to share His outlook, His sanity, and His habit of peace. His oft-repeated 'Courage!' became their mood of life.

It is significant that the Christian *Ecclesia* grew out of the most delightful of human experiences and associations. The Beloved Society was in its infancy, the Twelve whom Jesus called 'that they might be with Him.' Friendship was the foundation of the Church of the Apostles, and in nineteen centuries we have not been able to discover any fit substitute. Individuals may dream dreams and see visions—but to realize their dreams and to fulfil their visions they must go forward in company

<sup>1</sup> S. R. Driver, *The Ideals of the Prophets*, 1.

with their friends. Christian friendship must be an emulation of Christ's type of friendship. It must be warm, personal, and intimate.

Moreover, *the friendship of Jesus was universal.* He shared His revelation of God, His fellowship and His ministries of service and healing impartially. 'I have called you friends. All things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you.' Access of Jesus' friendship was not conditioned by learning, social position, or wealth. Socrates befriended his pupil Plato because Plato was a promising young philosopher. Schiller and Goethe were friends because Schiller loved to write a thrilling drama, and Goethe loved to read and discuss it. But Jesus was the Friend of illiterates ; of the most obscure men and women. The first churches, as Celsus reminds us, were made up of slaves who went about whispering to men and women, 'Only believe !'

Further, the universality of Jesus' friendship is evidenced by the fact that He continually befriended His enemies. This aspect of His disposition was a radical innovation in the history of friendship. Who among the Ancients would ever have dared to teach and live the doctrine which says : 'Love your enemies' ? Conversing with Chæcocrate in the *Memorabilia*, Socrates says : 'The man most greatly to be praised is he who anticipates his enemies in hurtfulness and his friends in helpfulness.' And it was Aristotle who said : 'Not to resent offences is the mark of the base and slavish man.'

When the people of Rome rejected some of the proposals of Cicero, the great orator called the populace 'a herd.' But when Judas was about to betray his Master unto death, Jesus said : 'Friend !'

When the people of this capital city seemed indifferent to his political ideas, Carlyle, who was engaged in writing his *History of the French Revolution*, looked out of his window in London and indignantly exclaimed : 'There are about three million people in this town—most of them fools !' But as we think of these words, we see another Man looking down upon His capital city. Let us listen to the words that fell from His lips : 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, that killeth the prophets and stoneth them that are sent unto her ! How often would I have gathered thy children together . . . and ye would not.'

The final characteristic which combines to reveal Jesus as the world's ideal Friend was *the redemptive adequacy of His friendship.* His friendship was not

employed towards any selfish ends. It was employed to save men from their sins, their ignorance, and their misery. For, after all, the world does not need an ideal so much as it needs a Saviour ! Therefore, the friendship of Jesus was more than friendship. It was disinterested, redemptive, vicarious love ! The mocking cry of the chief priests at the foot of the Cross holds more meaning than we usually think ! 'He saved others ; himself he could not save.' For it is not the character of redemptive and vicarious love to save itself.

We are standing at the cross-roads of history. Behind us is the cave and the jungle ; ahead of us is the Promised Land. The instincts of the hand call us to go back—back to the days of secret diplomacy, of domination through vested interests, of bigoted partisanship and narrow nationalism, and of their certain results—hate, war, death, pestilence !

Conversely, the instincts of the head and the heart cry : 'Go forward'—forward toward universal brotherhood, intelligent goodwill, and a United States of the World wherein the angelic song that stirred to awe and reverence the Shepherds at Bethlehem of Judæa shall have become the international anthem of the human race ! And between these two instinctive calls we must choose, and choose quickly.

But what shall we do ? We perceive the ideal, but how can we attain it ? What course shall we take ? We have tried wealth ; we have tried power ; we have tried learning, and what a ruin we have wrought !

I stood in the Louvre in Paris looking upon a noble painting by an unknown artist. The picture represents *The Night of the Crucifixion*. The world is wrapped in shadows, the stars in the sky are dead, and yet in the deepest darkness may be seen a kneeling form. It is Mary Magdalene, with loving lips and hands pressed gently against the bleeding feet of Christ. There was and is the only answer in heaven or on earth ! Not the way of wealth, of power, of learning—but the way of vicarious love ! Above, on the Cross, lo ! the Eternal Friend who understands all, who forgives all, and who loves all unto the end. Below, at the foot of the Cross, behold Mary Magdalene, the emblem of our sinful humanity, redeemed and forgiven, and now, even in the night of death, returning the love of the Great Lover who first loved us and gave Himself for us.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> H. D. M'Keehan, *The Patrimony of Life*, 44.

## Recent Biblical Archaeology.

BY THE REVEREND J. W. JACK, M.A., GLENFARG.

It was only in the sixteenth century that Palestine entered into the full light of history, and it is only within recent years that it has been opened up to scientific investigation and research. After Egypt and Babylonia, the turn of Palestine has come. In 1860 the Palestine Exploration Fund was established in London, and was followed by the German Oriental Society, and by the French Biblical School of Jerusalem. An abundant and reliable literature, dealing with the geography, the topography, and the ancient civilization of the Holy Land, soon appeared, and archaeologists ventured to explore and excavate. Among the first to do so were Flinders Petrie, who in 1890 uncovered the ancient fortress of Lachish, R. A. Stewart Macalister, who reconstituted the city of Gezer, and the German scholar Schumacher, who explored *Tell el-Mutesellim*, the site of the ancient Megiddo. Now, since the British Mandate of 1920, a new impetus has been given to archaeological research in Palestine, and many new societies have been formed and are busy at work, and new laws have been issued giving greater facilities to genuine scholars and archaeologists.

Since Dr. Garstang's excavations at Jericho, the question of the falling of the wall under the siege conducted by Joshua has given rise to some discussion. The theory of an earthquake seems unsatisfactory. It does not account for the coincidence of the sound of the trumpets and the fall of the wall, and seems to attribute to Joshua an unusual foreknowledge of seismic disturbances, inasmuch as his announcement of the taking of the town was made seven days before. The collapse of the wall is rather to be explained by the special tactics adopted in ancient times in besieging a town.<sup>1</sup> These tactics, which were already old in the time of Joshua, have been described by William of Tyre (A.D. 1130-1183), the historian of the Crusades.<sup>2</sup> He narrates how the walls of Nicæa (now *Isnik*), in Anatolia, fell in 1097 under the investing army. A body of sappers, protected in an armed *scrofa* or tank, mounted on wheels and moved from inside (such as we see on the Assyrian

bas-reliefs), advanced towards the walls and began to undermine the main tower. They filled up the gaps left by the removal of the stones with wooden supports or stanchions, to prevent the tower falling on the machine. After they had cleared away sufficient masonry for their purpose, they placed combustible material between the supports and set fire to the whole. They then abandoned the machine and withdrew to the camp. Towards midnight, when all the wooden beams had been consumed, the tower fell outward with a great noise. In this account by the Byzantine historian we have the method of siege adopted by eastern armies in ancient times, even fifteen or twenty centuries before Joshua—a device pictured on the Assyrian reliefs. It is true, the account does not mention the sound of trumpets nor the succeeding shout of the army, but these accompaniments are known to have occurred, in connexion with the above tactics, in the sieges of the Middle Ages. They are referred to by F. de Mély in his history of the château of Pierrefonds,<sup>3</sup> and by Végèce, a Latin military writer who lived at Constantinople towards the end of the fourth century A.D. The latter, in his book,<sup>4</sup> which treats of the military tactics of the Roman armies in earliest times as well as in his own day, states that it is at the sound of the trumpet that the work of sapping the walls ceases.<sup>5</sup> When the engineers judged that the work of undermining was sufficiently advanced, the trumpets sounded as a signal for the sappers to set fire to the wooden stanchions (usually covered with pitch or tar) and to withdraw to the camp. A few moments later the wall fell flat and the army could enter the town.

Is it not probable that we have here the key to the mystery of Jericho's falling walls? For six days Joshua simply marched his troops round the town, and then withdrew, thus lulling the vigilance of the besieged. This was done, we read, 'early' every morning, *i.e.* just as darkness was passing away (Jos 6<sup>12, 15</sup>), a fact which seems to have been overlooked. In the meantime the sappers had been working during the night. They had probably

<sup>3</sup> *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, Mai, 1926.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. F. de Mély, *Revue Archéologique*, Jan.-Juillet, 1931, p. 111 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum*, in twenty-five books. The best edition is the Paris one, 1884, *Recueil des histoires des Croisades*.

<sup>4</sup> *Epitoma Rei Militaris*, Edelang, 1885. The work has been translated into French at different times—1488, 1772 (Bongrass), and 1849 (Nisard), under the title *Institutions Militaires*.

<sup>5</sup> Book II. chapter xxii.

needed no machine or tank to approach with. Indeed, if the wall of this period was around the top of the slope, as Dr. Garstang believes, it could only be reached by creeping upward. On the seventh day ('early, about the dawning of the day,' Jos 6<sup>15</sup>), when the undermining was complete, a longer blast on the trumpets, different from that of the preceding days, warned the workers to set fire to the supports and inflammable material, and to withdraw at once. Then, amid the acclamations of the whole army, the wall fell outward, and the Israelites rushed into the town. 'It came to pass, when the people heard the sound of the trumpet, that they shouted with a great shout, and the wall fell down flat, so that the people went up into the city, every man straight before him, and they took the city' (Jos 6<sup>20</sup>). As Dr. Garstang has discovered signs of undermining and of burnt wood under the fallen walls, the hypothesis we have mentioned seems the most probable one. The wall was a double one, consisting of an outer one six feet thick, and an inner one twelve feet thick, with a small space between. The outer wall has been found tilted forward from its bed, and an examination shows that it may have been sapped. The inner one shows signs of dislocation in the masonry, general drawing out of the bonds, and subsidence of the left half *en masse*. 'Investigations along the west side show continuous signs of destruction and conflagration. The outer wall suffered most, its remains falling down the slope. The inner wall is preserved only where it abuts upon the citadel, or tower, to a height of eighteen feet; elsewhere it is found largely to have fallen, together with the remains of the buildings upon it, into the space between the walls which was filled with ruins and débris. Traces of intense fire are plain to see, including reddened masses of brick, cracked stones, charred timbers and ashes. Houses alongside the wall are found burned to the ground, their roofs fallen upon the domestic pottery within.'<sup>1</sup>

In a similar way, perhaps, we may explain the hail of great stones which fell 'from heaven' on the army of the five Amorite kings who were besieging Gibeon (Jos 10<sup>11</sup>). Végèce, in Book iv. of his work, mentions occurrences of exactly the same kind. There we read that the besieged usually placed great heaps of stones, large and small, on

the top of the ramparts, alongside the slinging and projectile machines (*onagri*, *fustibuli*, etc.), which were kept there in readiness against any near approach of the enemy. These engines of defence were very numerous (they amounted to as many as sixty in every Roman legion), something like the *mitrailleuses* or machine-guns of modern times. They could launch a veritable hail of stones, and as this came from the top of high walls and carried death into the plain to a distance of six hundred feet or more, it appeared in reality to fall from heaven. According to the account in Joshua (10<sup>6, 11</sup>), the armies of the five kings were encamped beneath the walls of the town. 'And it came to pass, as they fled before Israel (*i.e.* from before the walls), in the descent to Beth-horon, that the Lord cast down great stones from heaven upon them unto Azekah, and they died: they were more which died with hailstones than they whom the children of Israel slew with the sword.'

The work of the joint-expedition at Samaria (now *Sebastiya*) under Mr. J. W. Crowfoot, C.B.E., is progressing rapidly. Excavation has been carried on with about two hundred and fifty labourers at five different sites within the Herodian city, and also at two small groups of tombs, some of which are Israelite. Three of the sites referred to adjoin the areas which were cleared by the Harvard expedition over twenty years ago, while the other two are some distance away. On all the sites Mr. Crowfoot has found Israelite traces. One of the most important finds has been a section of the Israelite city wall on the south, dating probably from Omri's time. As it lies some three hundred and fifty yards east of the nearest portion unearthed by the previous expedition, it gives us a new idea of the size of the ancient capital. The section, so far as uncovered at the time of the last report, measures some sixty-five feet in length. It has been laid in a trench cut in the rock, and has still three courses of stone in position above the foundations, each course being about nineteen inches in height, with bosses on all the outer stones. At one point, immediately to the outside of the wall, the remains of an Israelite tower have been discovered. As a large Israelite tower was unearthed by the Harvard expedition on the west side of the city, overlooking the main gate, it is possible that there may have been rectangular towers at intervals, perhaps with battlements and palisades. The wall of Gezer had towers every thirty yards, and at Lachish there were even bastions containing enclosed spaces. At all events, the wall of Samaria must have been strong enough to withstand many a

<sup>1</sup> Statement signed at Jericho, 2nd March 1930, by Dr. Garstang and Père Vincent, and endorsed as to its archaeological conclusions by Dr. Clarence Fisher. See Garstang, *Joshua-Judges*, p. 145; and cf. Garstang, 'The Walls of Jericho,' in *P.E.F. Quarterly*, October 1931, p. 190 f.

prolonged siege. The finds in the tombs include beads, circular stone cosmetic jars, and large quantities of broken Israelite pottery, from which Mr. Crowfoot hopes to restore several new types of vessels.

At *Tell el-Ajjul* (Old Gaza), the Pompeii of the Hyksos Age, which Sir Flinders Petrie has been excavating this year, further significant discoveries have been made. The city lies on a bluff of sandstone, about fifty feet above the stream (*Wady Ghuzzeh*), and covers about thirty-three acres, or twenty times the size of Troy. The date of its abandonment (through being too unhealthy) has been easily ascertained. From the fact that three scarabs of Apepa I. (c. 2250 B.C.), and a bead with the cartouche of Amenemhat (c. 2375 B.C.), have been found in the upper level of the city, and that there are few remains later than the Bronze Age, it is clear that we must date the desertion of the place about 2200 B.C. Probably, as Sir Flinders thinks, it was a gradual movement extending over one or two centuries. The population shifted four or five miles to the north, where they built the present Gaza, just as the ancient sites of Gerar, Lachish, and other cities have been transferred elsewhere. The old city was the key one on the great coast road between Egypt and Asia, the first place where harbourage for shipping was possible, and all the trade that travelled the road passed here. The excavators may expect to find on this ancient site the results of commerce through all the early ages. The weights which Sir Flinders has examined show that Egypt was the chief customer, north Syria next, and Babylonia third. The city had to be well protected. The devious tunnel, five hundred feet long, by which the gate was reached, ranged in height from about four to six feet, and had grooves at two points on each side for holding beams by which it could be closed. The numerous houses which have already been uncovered, though between four and five thousand years old, are in a wonderful state of preservation. Probably this is due to the nature of the bricks, which have been made of tough, hard, yellow clay, about  $21 \times 14 \times 5$  inches, equal to a dozen modern bricks. They must have been brought from a distance, as Sir Flinders has not seen such clay in the neighbourhood. Some of the houses have square raised hearths, about three feet across, with plastered floor all round for sitting near the fire. The roadways in the city are about six or eight feet wide, though sometimes extending to ten or twelve feet. In our last review we referred to the discovery of two or three shrines, with provision for foot-washing before the door. As Sir

Flinders points out, these places show that the custom of ablution before worship did not originate with the Israelites, much less with Islam, but was an ancient Canaanite one. Similarly, at Beth-pelet he found Hyksos tombs with a row of large water-jars before the doors, like those referred to in the marriage at Cana of Galilee. One strange feature of the inhabitants at *el-Ajjul* seems to have been the practice of burying animals, generally donkeys, with their masters. In one tomb, four lay in a chamber beside the owner. An interesting find has been a horse skeleton, the earliest known. As the skull measures twenty-two inches long, it would seem that the Hyksos had great horses, like the Turkish invaders later. Another find of great interest, picked up beneath the mud of the main street, is a gold brooch, in the form of a falcon with upraised wings, which had apparently been dropped there by some girl four thousand years ago. It is as brilliant and beautiful, we are assured, as if it were new only yesterday, though there is no doubt as to its age. It is evident that further excavations on this dominant site will reveal to us much of the patriarchal ages, and throw a flood of light on early Biblical questions.

The Haverford Expedition, under Dr. Elihu Grant, has just concluded its fourth campaign at *Rumeileh* mound (ancient Beth-shemesh [south], in the valley of Sorek, south-east of Zorah, cf. Jos 15<sup>10</sup> [P], 1 S 6<sup>9</sup>, 2 Ch 28<sup>48</sup>). Just across the road (the old caravan route) is another mound, *Ain Shems*, or 'Well of the Sun,' which still preserves the ancient name. The town was probably the site of the temple which was erected in Palestine by Pharaoh Akhenaten, and which was called *Khinatuna* by the Canaanites. This temple was to serve for the monotheistic worship of the Sun-disk. It is generally supposed to have been at Jerusalem, but the name Beth-shemesh (LXX 'City of the Sun,' cf. Mt. Heres, Jg 1<sup>35</sup>) confirms our view. The place is interesting to Biblical students as being the country of Samson and Delilah. The similarity between the names Samson, Shemesh, Shems, and the connexion between Eben-ezer and the modern *Abn Meizar* and *Deir Abn* in the vicinity are apparent. The town, though one of the strong places of the Shephelah, was small, covering only seven acres (about the size of Jericho). It was always inhabited by Canaanites, but dominated successively by Hyksos, Egyptians, Philistines, and Hebrews. It had political connexions mostly with Egypt, but commercial relations with Cyprus and other Mediterranean countries. It was partly excavated twenty years ago by Dr. Duncan Mackenzie, a

trained Mediterranean scholar, under the Palestine Exploration Fund, and the results were published in two special 'Annals.' He came to the conclusion that the Late Bronze Age town was destroyed about 1400 B.C., which accords with the fall of Jericho and the invasion of the Habiru (Hebrews). The mound still continues to yield rich archaeological results. During the last campaign considerable painted ware has turned up, as well as carinated bowls, bilbils, stirrup-vases, jugs developed from the pyx form, Cypriote milk-bowls with wish-bone handle, seals, stamps, beads, lamps, bronze weapons, and numerous other valuable articles. A fragment of an iron tool still shows bronze rivets by which it had been fixed in the wooden handle. The life of the humble Canaanite inhabitants can be surmised and partly read from such objects, and we can picture the terror when Sennacherib appeared before the walls about 700 B.C. and finally destroyed the town.

Work continues to go on at other places in southern Palestine. There has been further discussion as to whether *Beit Mirsim* (some thirteen miles south-west of Hebron), where Professor W. F. Albright has been excavating, is actually the site of Debir (otherwise Kiriath-sepher, 'City of Letters'). A writer in the *Revue Biblique* (July 1931, p. 478) controverts this view, and holds that Debir is to be located at the village of *Daheriyé*, in the mountains of Hebron, on the road which leads down from this town to Beersheba. Here ancient tombs have been discovered, containing pottery of the Early Iron Age. At the same time, *Beit Mirsim* satisfies more closely than any other site the topographical and historical conditions required. Here excavations have disclosed a walled city and other special features which agree with the Biblical references. The lowest stratum dates from the Early Bronze Age, before 2000 B.C., when the houses appear to have been constructed largely of wood. Later, during the latter part of the Middle Bronze Age (2000-1600 B.C.), when Canaanite civilization was at its highest, there were defensive walls from ten to thirteen feet thick, strengthened on the outside by a sloping revetment of stonework. During the last period of the Hebrew Conquest, that is, in the latter half of the fourteenth century B.C., the city was destroyed by the Israelite-Kenite allies under Othniel, and according to Albright there are signs that the destruction was 'accompanied by a terrific conflagration and by the complete demolition of its fortifications.' It was rebuilt by them on the ashes and débris, and its outline remained much the same, though its walls were never so strong.

The wonderful discoveries of a Phœnician library and college belonging to the twelfth century B.C., which have recently been made by Chaeffer and Chenet at *Ras Shamra* and *Minet el-Beida*, on the Syrian coast, a little north of Laodicea, add considerably to our knowledge of Palestinian civilization and elucidate certain Biblical texts. The library buildings, judging from the ruins, must have been large, and as numerous manuals and exercise books have been unearthed, it appears to have been an institution for the training of scribes and *savants*. Some of the tablets discovered are in the Accadian or Assyro-Babylonian language (used for diplomatic relations), some in Sumerian (the Latin of the epoch, reserved for scholars and priests), and some in a strange enigmatical language not yet translated; while several others again (about a dozen) are in Phœnician, for which an alphabetical cuneiform, consisting of twenty-eight letters and hitherto quite unknown, has been employed. These last have now been deciphered by Charles Virolleaud, Père Dhorme, René Dussaud, and other epigraphists, and the first named is preparing a volume on them with transcription, translation, and lexicon. One of the tablets measures over nine inches in breadth, and contains eight columns, with a total of six hundred lines, though a third only of these has been preserved. The text of the tablets contains the expression 'the sons of God' (*benê-El*), which corresponds exactly with the same expression in Gn 6<sup>2, 4</sup> (*benê-Elohim*). Various divinities are mentioned, including the god Shalem (whose name forms the second constituent of the word 'Urusalim' or Jerusalem), and another who bears the name Dn-El, which means 'God of justice' or 'God is judge.' The latter was the defender of the feeble and oppressed. 'He renders justice,' we read, 'to the widow and orphan.' He was probably the legendary Daniel mentioned in two passages of Ezekiel. In the one passage (14<sup>14, 20</sup>) Noah, Job, and Daniel are commended for their virtue—which is precisely the case with the Dn-El of *Ras Shamra*. In the other (28<sup>3</sup>), where we have an ironical apostrophe launched against the king of Tyre, who aspired to be a god, dwelling in his sanctuary amid the seas, the prophet exclaims, 'Behold, thou art wiser than Daniel!' It is clear that, if the king of Tyre was to understand this reference, the Daniel referred to had to be one well known to the Phœnicians, and could not have been the Biblical Daniel of the Achæmenid epoch; and this seems all the more likely, seeing that evidence shows that *Ras Shamra* (Egyptian, *Zapuna*) was a Tyrian colony. In whatever aspect we regard these

Syrian archives—whether we think of the origin of writing, of philology, of Semitic linguistics, of Phœnician religious beliefs, or of Old Testament interpretation—their discovery is assuredly one of the most important made in the Near East, and constitutes a real revelation of the literary activity (a veritable Renaissance) which was going on in Palestine in the twelfth century B.C., at the time of the Israelite judges.

Who the early inhabitants of Palestine were, we cannot tell. In the later palæolithic times they lived mostly in the caves, a fact which has been proved by the remains discovered there. They were hunters and fishers, clothed in skins, which they managed to sew together by means of bone needles, many of which have been found. They were not acquainted with the arts of pottery and weaving, and seem to have had no knowledge of agriculture or the breeding of cattle. Hitherto we have known little of these cave-dwellers, but now a flood of light is being thrown on their lives and habits. They were a non-Semitic race, of small build, with thick skulls, and great muscular strength. Within the last two or three years, the haunts of

these aborigines have been explored by capable prehistorians. In 1925 a cave in Galilee, north of Tiberias, produced a skull-fragment of Neanderthal type, with Mousterian implements. Lately, discoveries of prehistoric remains have been made by Miss Dorothy Garrod, Mr. T. McCown, and others in the caves near *Athlit*, which are being excavated for the British School of Archæology in Jerusalem. In one of the caves, Mr. McCown has found the skull and parts of a child in a layer of breccia of Mousterian age. These have been extracted in a single block and sent to the Royal College of Surgeons for examination. Dr. van Heerden's party has come across mesolithic burials with head-dresses and necklaces made of shells and bone beads. Ten miles away, at *Mugharet el-Kabara*, Mr. Turville Petre has discovered several mesolithic objects, including bone harpoons and carved bone sickle shafts. These early inhabitants of Palestine, probably over ten thousand years ago, clearly knew nothing of metal-working, and used only implements of bone and flint. No doubt, many traces of them will yet appear under the rubbish of succeeding races and civilizations.

---

## Entre Nous.

### Religious Book Week.

We have advanced the date of publication of the magazine this month so as to take some share in Religious Book Week. A special article on 'The Ministry of Books' has been written for this number by Professor J. E. McFadyen, in which he discusses the causes of the prevailing indifference to religious books, and shows what an inspiration the reading of them might be.

### The Troubled Covenanter.

Mr. Sidney Dark, the journalist, does not know how to be dull. His *Robert Louis Stevenson*, just published by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton (12s. 6d. net), is interesting and provocative from cover to cover. But it is the second and penultimate chapters of this volume that specially concern us. These are the work of Mr. Sidney Dark, the theologian, and editor of 'The Church Times,' and their concern is the religion of R.L.S. Mr. Dark's thesis is that Stevenson never escaped from the influence of his early environment. He was always 'the troubled covenanter.' 'There are faiths and faiths, but I can find little justification for Mr.

Chesterton's description of Stevenson as "a highly honourable, responsible, and chivalrous Pagan." I contend that he remained to the end a highly honourable, responsible, and chivalrous Scottish Puritan.'

Stevenson, Mr. Dark reminds us, was brought up in a religious atmosphere. 'His mother was a daughter of the manse. His father, Sir Graham Balfour says, "clung with a desperate intensity to the rigid tenets of his faith." His nurse was a woman of extreme piety.' A story, which is not too well known, is told by Mr. Dark to illustrate the piety of the home in which Stevenson was brought up, and the remarkable way in which even as a child of six he had a grasp of the meaning of its religious teaching and could not only repeat but apply it in new ways. An uncle had offered a prize for the best History of Moses, and Stevenson dictated his version to his mother, and the moral of his tale is: 'Then God told Moses to take some brass and soften it in the fire and to cut it into the shape of one of the serpents, and to put it upon a pole and to hold up the pole and the Israelites who looked at the serpent would get better. That should

put us in mind of Jesus, because the old Serpent the Devil bit us, that means made us naughty, and when we look at Jesus that makes us better—not to look at Jesus with our eyes but to look with praying.’

Although Stevenson in his adolescence began to doubt his father’s faith and to rebel against the strictness of his upbringing, Mr. Dark discounts the usual view of his University years in Edinburgh. ‘He may have philandered with the devil, but there was never any serious intrigue, and this he admitted in his essay, *Crabbed Age and Youth*: “Those who go to the devil in youth with anything like a fair chance were probably little worth saving from the first.” With regard to his later years he joins issue with Mr. Chesterton’s statement. “When Stevenson stepped into the wider world of the Continent with its more graceful logic and even its more graceful vice,” says Mr. Chesterton, “he went as one emptied of all the ethics and all the metaphysics of his home.” Mr. Dark believes that R.L.S. took the ethics and a good deal of the metaphysics with him. ‘Certainly Stevenson never escaped, nor did he wish to escape, from God. No Hound of Heaven had to make him his quarry. But his God was the Scottish Covenanter’s God—I am again indebted to Mr. Chesterton—“the Lord,” not “Our Lord” of the Catholic.’

Of a’ the ills that flesh can fear,  
The loss o’ frien’s, the lack o’ gear,  
A yowlin’ tyke, a glandered mear,  
A lassie’s nonsense—  
There’s just ae thing I canna bear,  
An’ that’s my conscience.

In the second last chapter of the volume Mr. Dark turns again to Stevenson’s religion, and again he rouses us to thought. He agrees with Professor Sarolea that Montaigne represents the anti-Calvinistic reaction of the sixteenth century, but cannot agree with him that Stevenson represents the anti-Puritan of the nineteenth. ‘In stark contrast to Montaigne, Stevenson was constantly professing repentance and the need of repentance, and so insistently did he feel the need that, in the manner of the Salvation Army convert, he took pleasure in exaggerating youthful wickedness. Stevenson wrote in *Crabbed Age and Youth*: “If a man live to any considerable age, it cannot be denied that he laments his imprudences.” Montaigne lamented nothing but ill fortune. Stevenson wrote in *The Amateur Emigrant*: “You cannot run away from a weakness; you must some time fight it out or perish.” Montaigne would have said that

as you cannot run away from a weakness, you had better enjoy it.’

‘Man is indeed marked for failure in his efforts to do right,’ Stevenson wrote in *Pulvis et Umbra*. And Mr. Dark comments, ‘Therefore, say Montaigne and Samuel Butler and Ibsen and Mr. Shaw, let him be content to be himself. But Stevenson perceives that, however certain the failure, the striving will continue. Man will go on searching for the Holy Grail.’

‘Often doubting, often bewildered, Stevenson was a man of faith. Life was hard. Failure was certain. But man created in the image of his Maker was assured of final victory. “The best that is in us is better than we can understand.”’

#### Some Tales of Dr. Peake.

Our first ‘Note’ this month treats of Peake, the great theologian. Here we see his lighter side. For the tales we are indebted to ‘Ezra’ of *The Methodist Recorder*, and he in his turn is indebted for them to the Rev. Samuel Horton. One of the favourite stories of Dr. Peake’s students was that of a day when he was about to write a Greek word on the blackboard in his lecture-room, and a student said: ‘You need not trouble to write it, Doctor, we understand Greek.’ ‘I wish I did,’ was the all too effective retort. Another delightful little story is told of how he treated a new student, who arrived at Hartley thinking more highly of himself than he had just cause for thinking, because he had already taken a university degree. The newcomer entered the common-room, and found the Doctor reading at one of the end tables. ‘I am Mr. Blank, M.A.,’ he said, by way of introducing himself. ‘Oh yes,’ replied the doctor, in dulcet tones, ‘and I am Peake.’ Delightful, too, is the story of the country lay preacher, who approached him after a service, and said: ‘Dr. Peake, you said during your sermon there were two Isaiahs. Well, I say there were not. There was only one.’ ‘Ah, well,’ replied the Doctor, ‘that settles it.’ Even more delightful is his reported reply to a student who raised his voice in class. ‘Did you say, Doctor,’ he asked, ‘that the Book of Genesis was not of Mosaic origin?’ And truth and wit mingled in the Professor’s ready answer: ‘That is exactly what it is—a mosaic!’

---

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.